

31  
R. FRITH

Government  
Publications

F I N A L   R E P O R T

(Volume 2)


Authors: J.D. Hoffman and N. Ward

Title: Bilingualism and Biculturalism  
in the House of Commons

Div: III

Report No: 2





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761120625264>

CA1Z1

-63 B500

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE

ARMED SERVICES

A Study Prepared for the

Special Committee on Intelligence and Communications

## VOLUME II

J. E. Hoffman and Robert Clark

Smith, 1964





BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM IN THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS

A Study Prepared for the  
Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

J.D. Hoffman and Norman Ward

March, 1966.





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
FOREWORD.....	xvi

## (VOL. 1)

### PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE: THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF BILINGUALISM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT AS A REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY.....	36

### PART TWO

CHAPTER THREE: THE SURVEY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: METHODS AND PROBLEMS.....	48
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CANADIAN M.P.'S' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLES.....	95
CHAPTER FIVE: THE CANADIAN M.P.'S PERFORMANCE OF HIS ROLE: THE LINK WITH HIS CONSTITUENCY.....	166

## (VOL. 2)

CHAPTER SIX: THE CANADIAN M.P. AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS: ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCE.....	201
CHAPTER SEVEN: ATTITUDES, COMMUNICATION AND THE PERCEPTION OF OTHERS.....	286
CHAPTER EIGHT: BILINGUALISM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.	342
CHAPTER NINE: FRENCH CANADIAN M.P.S IN FEDERAL POLITICS.....	367
CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSION.....	384
APPENDICES.....	





## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD .....	xvi
Chapter	
One: THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF BILINGUALISM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS .....	1
I. The Legal and Constitutional Framework .....	2
II. The Use of the Language Provisions .....	7
III. Parliamentary Biculturalism .....	22
Two: THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT AS A REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY ...	36
Three: THE SURVEY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: METHODS AND PROBLEMS ..	48
I. Purposes and Problems .....	48
II. The Course of the Research .....	49
(1) The Preliminary Stage: Defining the Project: June 1 to July 20, 1964 .....	49
(2) The Preliminary Interviews: July 20 to August 31, 1964 .....	50
(3) The Drafting of the Interview Schedule: September 1, 1964, to February 15, 1965 .....	51
(4) Training the Interviewers: February 16 to March 4, 1965 .....	53
(5) Drawing the Sample: March 1-2, 1965 .....	54
(6) Interviewing the M.P.'s: March 8 to April 9, 1965 .....	55
(7) The "Crisis": April 2 to April 15, 1965 .....	61
(8) Reappraising the Project: April 15, 1965 .....	72
(9) Drawing a Stratified Sample: April 19 to 24, 1965 ..	
(10) Completing the Interviews with Back Benchers: April 26 to June 30, 1965 .....	77
(11) Interviewing the Front Benchers, June 1 to September 3, 1965 .....	85
(12) Coding the Data: June 21 to September 3, 1965 .....	88
(13) Analyzing the Data .....	90
Four: THE CANADIAN M.P.'S' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR ROLES .....	95
I. Political Involvement .....	95
II. Pre-Parliamentary Political Experience .....	105
III. M.P.'s' Perceptions of Their Roles .....	109
IV. Representational Roles .....	112
V. Areal Roles .....	131
VI. Purposive Roles .....	140
VII. The Perception of Role Differences .....	145
VIII. Summary .....	161





Chapter	Page
Five: THE CANADIAN M.P.'S PERFORMANCE OF HIS ROLE: THE LINK WITH HIS CONSTITUENCY .....	166
I. The Flow of Information from Constituency to M.P....	166
II. Keeping in Touch with Constituents .....	182
III. Keeping in Touch with Local Party Organizations ...	196
IV. Summary .....	198
Six: THE CANADIAN M.P. AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS: ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCE .....	201
I. Political Orientations .....	201
II. General Attitudes towards Parliament .....	231
III. Parliamentary Aspects of the M.P.'s Role: General Considerations .....	247
(1) Political Interests .....	248
(2) Problems of the Job .....	256
(3) Attitudes towards the Backbencher's Place in the Legislative Process .....	263
(4) Party Caucuses: General, Provincial and Regional .....	269
(5) The Qualities of a "Good M.P." .....	277
IV. Summary .....	282
Seven: ATTITUDES, COMMUNICATION AND THE PERCEPTION OF OTHERS ...	286
I. Attitudes .....	286
II. Communications .....	289
III. Perceptions of Others .....	318
(1) Ottawa as seen by Members of Parliament .....	318
(2) Self-Perceptions and the Perceptions of Others ...	324
(3) Specific Roles of Language Groups .....	327
IV. Summary .....	340
Eight: BILINGUALISM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS .....	342
I. The Translation System .....	342
II. The Use of French by Ministers .....	353
III. The Extension of Translation Facilities .....	358
IV. Bilingualism within the Political Parties .....	361
Nine: FRENCH CANADIAN M.P.'S IN FEDERAL POLITICS .....	367
Ten: CONCLUSIONS .....	384





- APPENDIX A: Further note on "An examination of the way in which Parliament reflects Canadian cultural dualism", etc.
- APPENDIX B: Interview Schedule for Canadian Backbench M.P.'s
- APPENDIX C: Statement by Co-Chairmen of the Commission, April 13, 1965
- APPENDIX D: Average Length of Interviews
- APPENDIX E: Interviewers Ratings of Respondents
- APPENDIX F: Newspaper Editorial Reaction to M.P. Survey
- APPENDIX G: Copy of letter sent to English-speaking Front Benchers.



## LIST OF TABLES

## Chapter One

Table 1.1	Use of French in the House of Commons for selected years, 1880-1963 .....	10
Table 1.2	Average number of questions asked by M.P.s in the first two sessions of the twenty-sixth Parliament, by party and language groups .....	29
Table 1.3	Chairmanships and vice-chairmanships of committees, by mother tongue, for selected sessions, House of Commons, in percentages .....	33

## Chapter Two

Table 2.1	Membership in the House of Commons in 1963 by ethnic origin, compared with the population .....	37
Table 2.2	Composition of House of Commons by members' birthplaces, for Parliaments elected in selected years .....	38
Table 2.3	Composition of the House of Commons in 1963 by linguistic group, with mother tongue of the population .....	39
Table 2.4	Composition of the House of Commons in 1963, and the population, by religious affiliation .....	40
Table 2.5	Composition of the House of Commons in 1963 by members' educational status, in percentages .....	41
Table 2.6	Age Composition of the House of Commons elected in 1963 .....	42
Table 2.7	Age Composition of the House of Commons for Parliaments elected in selected years .....	43
Table 2.8	New members in the House of Commons for Parliaments elected in selected years, in percentages .....	44
Table 2.9	The composition of the House of Commons by years of members' service, at the end of selected Parliaments .....	44
Table 2.10	Composition of the House of Commons election in 1963, classified by members' years of service .....	45
Table 2.11	Composition of the House of Commons elected in 1963, on the Blisshen groupings .....	46





	<u>Page</u>
Chapter Three	
Table 3.1 Interviewers' ratings of respondents .....	59
Table 3.2 The "front bench" .....	74
Tables 3.3 to 3.6 Stratified sample of back benchers analyzed by region (3.3); bilingual orientation (3.4); party (3.5); and urban/rural location of M.P.'s constituency (3.6) .....	76
Table 3.7 Completed, incompleted and refused interviews with back bench M.P.s in stratified sample (Part A only)	80
Table 3.8 Completed and refused responses to Part B of the questionnaire (stratified sample of back benchers)	81
Tables 3.9 to 3.12 Refusals or not available (Part A of questionnaire) by region (3.9); bilingual orientation (3.10); party (3.11); urban/rural location of M.P.'s constituency (3.12) .....	82
Tables 3.13 to 3.16 Refusals (Part B of questionnaire) by region (3.13); bilingual orientation (3.14); party (3.14); urban/rural location of M.P.'s constituency (3.16) .....	83
Tables 3.17 to 3.19 Interviews, refusals and not availables with front bench respondents .....	87
Table 3.20 Distribution of responses to question dealing with solutions to problem of communication between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s .....	92
Table 3.21 Revised code categories (second stage analysis) ....	93
Chapter Four	
Table 4.1 Recruitment method of English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	103
Table 4.2 Representational role perceptions of backbench M.P.s, by party .....	120
Table 4.3 Representational role perceptions of backbench M.P.s, by regions .....	121
Table 4.4 Disposition of respondents to stick to their own views in conflict with those of their constituents, by urban/rural location of the M.P.'s constituency .....	124





Table 4.5	Disposition of respondents to stick to their own views in conflict with those of their party, by party .....	125
Table 4.6	Disposition of respondents to stick to their own views in conflict with those of their party, by regions .....	126
Table 4.7	Self-attributed behaviour of English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s confronted by an issue in which their party's position was at odds with the wishes of most of their constituents .....	127
Table 4.8	Areal role perceptions of backbench M.P.s, by regions .....	135
Table 4.9	Areal role perceptions of backbench M.P.s, by regions .....	136
Table 4.10	Role perceptions of English and French-speaking backbench M.P.s .....	143
Table 4.11	Liaison officer, ombudsman and lawmaker perceptions of the role of M.P., by region .....	144
Table 4.12	Responses of M.P.s from all parties to the question of whether M.P.s from other parties would describe the job of M.P. in much the same way as they have...	147
Table 4.13	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to the question of whether there are any differences between their present views and the ideas they had of the role of M.P. before going to Ottawa .....	152
Table 4.14	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to the question of whether there are any differences between their own views on the role of the M.P. and those of their constituents .....	154
Table 4.15	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to the statement that "Constituents are always asking M.P.s to do something which has nothing to do with their jobs in Ottawa" .....	156
Table 4.16	Responses of M.P.s to the statement that "constituents are always asking M.P.s to do something which has nothing to do with their jobs in Ottawa", by region .....	157
Table 4.17	Responses of backbench M.P.s to the statement that "most constituents are more interested in the services an M.P. can perform than in his views on legislation" (a) by principal language group, (b) by region .....	158



## Chapter Five

Table 5.1	Backbench members noting conversations with constituents and party organizations as sources of constituents' feelings .....	168
Table 5.2	Backbench members noting conversations with constituents, party organizations and letters as sources of constituents' feelings .....	169
Table 5.3	Ranking of sources of good information and advice on political issues, based on percentage of ratings in top three choices .....	172
Table 5.4	Amount of mail received by French and English-speaking backbench M.P.s in an average week .....	174
Table 5.5	Amount of mail received by different representational role types in an average week .....	176
Table 5.6	Subjects of letters received by backbench M.P.s ...	177
Table 5.7	Predominant subject matter of letters received by English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	178
Table 5.8	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to the proposition: "Often M.P.s get so involved in affairs in Ottawa that they lose touch with their constituents." .....	182
Table 5.9	Comparison of French and English-speaking M.P.s in terms of habitation in Ottawa during the parliamentary session .....	186
Table 5.10	Comparison by regions of M.P.s in terms of their habitation in Ottawa during the parliamentary session ...	187..
Table 5.11	Average number of days spent in constituency during the parliamentary session, by region .....	188
Table 5.12	Average number of days spent in constituency during the parliamentary session by English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	190
Table 5.13	Methods mentioned by English and French-speaking M.P.s for making themselves available to constituents ..	192
Table 5.14	Techniques employed by English and French-speaking M.P.s to communicate with their constituents .....	195





## Chapter Six

Table 6.1	Reasons for running again for Parliament, offered by English and French-speaking M.P.s who said that they definitely would be running for Parliament again .....	206
Table 6.2	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to: "If for some reason you had to give up being an M.P. today, what would you miss the most?" .....	209
Table 6.3	Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to: "are there any public offices you would like to seek some time in the future?" .....	212
Table 6.4	Responses of backbench M.P.s to: "Do you think that one loses money in politics, even if one wins the election and gets the indemnity?" .....	217
Table 6.5	Comparison of responses of backbench M.P.s, by regions, showing the relationship between attitudes of constituents towards the job and the M.P.'s belief that one loses money in politics .....	219
Table 6.6	Comparison of responses to the question of whether or not one loses money in politics with responses to the question of whether or not M.P.s are chronically underpaid .....	220
Table 6.7	English and French-speaking M.P.s' responses to: "M.P.s, in view of the demands made upon them, are chronically underpaid." .....	221
Table 6.8	Comparison of French and English-speaking Liberals on the question of whether or not one loses money in politics and whether or not M.P.s are chronically underpaid .....	222
Table 6.9	Comparison of M.P.s from the different regions on the question of whether or not one loses money in politics and whether or not M.P.s are chronically underpaid .....	223
Table 6.10	Responses of backbench M.P.s interviewed before the crisis compared with those interviewed after the crisis on the statement: "Politics is a dirty game." ..	226
Table 6.11	Responses of backbench M.P.s to the statement that "Politics is a dirty game," by party .....	228





Table 6.12	Responses of English-speaking M.P.s who are sympathetic and unsympathetic towards French Canadians on the question of whether politics is a dirty game .....	230
Table 6.13	Responses, by party, of backbench M.P.s to: "Our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation." .....	233
Table 6.14	Judgment of the effectiveness of the House of Commons by English and French-speaking M.P.s ...	234
Table 6.15	Pressing problems (and by implication reforms) mentioned by English and French-speaking respondents who were at all critical of the effectiveness of the House of Commons .....	236
Table 6.16	Pressing problems of House of Commons, by party....	239
Table 6.17	Responses of M.P.s to: "Dominion-provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament, by party .....	241
Table 6.18	Responses of backbench M.P.s to: "The House of Commons would be a more efficient institution if it were cut to, say, 150 members, each with paid assistants." .....	242
Table 6.19	Main political interests of English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	252
Table 6.20	English and French-speaking Liberals' main political interests .....	252
Table 6.21	Major methods used by English and French-speaking M.P.s to further their main political interests....	255
Table 6.22	Responses of backbench M.P.s to: "Most of the time front bench policy is already decided before a backbencher has a chance to exert influence." ...	265
Table 6.23	Responses of backbench M.P.s to: "...Party caucus ... is not a place for influencing party policy." .....	267
Table 6.24	Major functions of party caucus as seen by English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	271
Table 6.25	Perceptions of the major functions of party caucus, by party .....	273



Table 6.26	Responses of backbench M.P.s to the statement that the provincial caucus is an unwelcome addition to the House of Commons, by party .....	277
Table 6.27	Qualities of a "good M.P." mentioned by English and French-speaking M.P.s .....	280
Chapter Seven		
Table 7.1	Attitudes of English-speaking M.P.s towards French Canadians and attitudes of French-speaking M.P.s towards English Canadians after entering Parliament	288
Table 7.2	Attitudes to French Canadians (English-speaking respondents only) by region .....	288
Table 7.3	Reasons offered by English-speaking M.P.s for becoming unsympathetic to French Canadians .....	290
Table 7.4	Respondents stating that informal contacts between M.P.s make for greater sympathy/less sympathy .....	293
Table 7.5	Responses of French-speaking and English-speaking Liberals to question on problems of communication between French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s .....	294
Table 7.6	Responses of M.P.s to question on problem of communication between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s, analyzed by region .....	296
Table 7.7	Proposed solutions to problem of communication mentioned by English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s recognizing the problem .....	298
Table 7.8	Comparison, by regions, of respondents thinking there is no problem of communication with respondents who, recognizing there is a problem, feel there is no solution to the problem .....	299
Table 7.9	Closest friends of respondents, analyzed by M.P.s' principal language group .....	303
Table 7.10	English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s mentioning useful contacts for better understanding of point of view .....	305
Table 7.11	M.P.s mentioning useful contacts for understanding point of view, by region .....	306





Table 7.12	French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s mentioning personalities respected for views on relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada .....	310
Table 7.13	French-speaking and English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives mentioning personalities respected for views on relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada ....	310
Table 7.14	M.P.s mentioning personalities respected for views on relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada, by regions .....	311
Table 7.15	Liberal and Conservative M.P.s mentioning personalities respected for views on relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada, by region .....	312
Table 7.16	Personalities respected for views on relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada .....	314
Table 7.17	M.P.s mentioning "contacts" and "personalities" analyzed by regions (measure of interest in question of relations between English and French Canada) .....	315
Table 7.18	Replies of English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s to question of whether or not French Canadians feel at home in Ottawa .....	319
Table 7.19	M.P.s' replies to question of whether or not French Canadians are at home in Ottawa, by urban/rural location of M.P.'s constituency .....	320
Table 7.20	M.P.s' replies to question of whether or not French Canadians are at home in Ottawa, by regions .....	322
Table 7.21	Replies of English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals to the proposition that "English Canadian M.P.s enjoy more freedom from their constituency organizations than French Canadian M.P.s .....	327
Table 7.22	English-speaking and French-speaking respondents mentioning specific role in House of Commons or party for English Canadian and French Canadian M.P.s .....	329



Table 7.23	Percentage of respondents denying specific role to French Canadian M.P.s, by regions .....	330
Table 7.24	English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals denying a specific role to English Canadian and French Canadian M.P.s .....	331
Table 7.25	French-speaking and English-speaking respondents' estimates of success of French-speaking M.P.s in playing a specific role within the House of Commons or their party .....	334
Table 7.26	Liberal, Conservative and N.D.P. estimates of the degree of success of French-speaking M.P.s in playing a specific role within the House of Commons or their parties .....	335
Table 7.27	English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s' opinion on whether or not French Canadians are ill-at-ease in federal politics .....	336
Table 7.28	English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals' opinion on whether or not French-Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics .....	337
Table 7.29	M.P.s' Opinion on whether French Canadian is ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics, by regions .....	338
Chapter Eight		
Table 8.1	Effects of bilingualism on the operations of Parliament mentioned by English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s .....	347
Table 8.2	Evaluation of the translation system by English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s .....	349
Table 8.3	Opinions on the effect of bilingualism on the operations of Parliament, and M.P.s' evaluation of the translation system, by regions .....	351
Table 8.4	French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s' opinions of part played by the Speaker in the operations of the bilingual system .....	352
Table 8.5	English and French-speaking M.P.s' opinion on the suggestion that "It would be better if French-speaking ministers always spoke French..." .....	355





Page

Table 8.6	English-speaking Liberals', Conservatives', and New Democrats' opinion on the suggestion that "It would be better if French-speaking ministers always spoke French .....	356
Table 8.7	M.P.s' opinions on the suggestion that "It would be better if French-speaking ministers always spoke French..." .....	357
Table 8.8	English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s' opinions on whether translation facilities should be extended to all committee rooms, whatever the cost .....	359
Table 8.9	English-speaking Liberals', Conservatives', New Democrats' and Social Crediters' opinions on whether translation facilities should be extended to all committee rooms, whatever the cost .....	360
Chapter Nine		
Table 9.1	English and French-speaking backbenchers agreeing with: "Most M.P.s learn more by keeping their mouths shut than by trying to prove how smart they are." .....	376



## CHAPTER SIX

### THE CANADIAN M.P. AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS: ATTITUDES AND PERFORMANCE

In the previous chapter we were mainly concerned to discover experiential differences among our respondents: we wanted to know, for example, whether French-speaking M.P.s received more or less mail than English-speaking M.P.s. In this chapter we are also interested in experiential differences. We want to know, for example, whether French-speaking M.P.s attend party caucus more frequently than English-speaking M.P.s or whether French-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to talk to cabinet ministers in pursuit of their political interests. But we are primarily interested in discovering whether there are attitudinal differences, especially as these relate to the operations of the party system and the House of Commons. As a preliminary to such an examination, it is useful to explore the orientation of Members to the political process generally. What follows must of course be considered along with the analysis already presented dealing with the historical context and role perceptions.

#### 1. Political Orientations

To begin with it is useful to know whether Canadian M.P.s regard the position of Member of Parliament as a full-time job and whether or not there are variations in the responses on the subject. Briefly put, the answer is that the vast majority of M.P.s (82.5%) think that the job is a full-time one, and the only variation worth noting in the pattern of responses is that





Prairie M.P.s are most inclined to say that it is not a full-time job<sup>1</sup> and M.P.s from British Columbia are unanimously disposed to say that it is. Language differences,<sup>2</sup> party, and urban/rural location of the M.P.'s constituency reveal no significant variations whatever.

When M.P.s stated that the job is a full-time one, however, it did not necessarily mean that they had no other commitments; 82.5% stated that they consider being an M.P. a full-time job, but only 50.4% of the respondents stated that they had no other commitments. French-speaking M.P.s are a little more inclined to say that they had other commitments, although they were as inclined as English-speaking M.P.s to agree that the job was full-time. Nearly twenty per cent of the respondents said that they maintained a law practice; six per cent said they still managed farms; less than five per cent said they managed insurance businesses; nearly 13 per cent said they continued to manage their own businesses; and nearly seven per cent mentioned other commitments, such as medical practices, editorial work, and local government service. Farm commitments were mentioned only by English-speaking M.P.s, and insurance businesses were mentioned mainly by French-speaking respondents; otherwise there was no difference in the pattern of responses.

If a respondent mentioned having another commitment, we then asked him: "How much time, on average, do these commitments take during the parliamentary session?" The answers received to this question help us to understand better how Members, who admit that being an M.P. is a full-time job, could

---

<sup>1</sup>Only 72.2% of Prairie M.P.s stated that it is a full-time job.

<sup>2</sup>84.3% of the English-speaking M.P.s said that being an M.P. is a full-time job, compared with 78.4% of the French-speaking M.P.s.



nevertheless say that they had other commitments as well, for the vast majority of the M.P.s who mentioned other commitments claim that these commitments take, on average, only one day or less a month during the session. Only 21.4% of respondents stated that their other commitments take more than one day a month, and this is roughly the same percentage of respondents who stated that they did not think that being an M.P. was a full-time job in any case.<sup>3</sup>

We noted above that French-speaking M.P.s are a little more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to say that they have other commitments. If we exclude the "refused to answer's" and compare only those who gave a definite answer as to how much time their other commitments take on average during a normal month during which Parliament is sitting, we find that French-speaking M.P.s are a little more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to spend more than one day at their other commitments: 27.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s mentioned spending two or more days at other commitments as compared with only 20.7% of English-speaking M.P.s; and it was also clear that (in the very few cases involved) French-speaking M.P.s tended to mention (proportionately) a greater number of days involved in other commitments than English-speaking M.P.s. However, if we regard those who refused to answer the question as in fact spending more than one day at other commitments and compare the results as between the two principal language groups, French-speaking M.P.s still appear to be slightly more inclined than English-

---

<sup>3</sup>Only six M.P.s, five English-speaking and one French-speaking who stated that they had other commitments refused to tell us how long these commitments take. If we can assume that those who refused to answer the question in fact tend to spend more than one day, on average, on their other commitments, the total percentage of M.P.s involved in other commitments on more than one day a month during the parliamentary session is still only 26.5.





speaking M.P.s to spend more time at other commitments, but the difference is even less than the figures given above.

As a further measure of the M.P.'s attitude towards his job and his general involvement in federal politics, we asked all respondents whether they expected to run again for Parliament. We had hoped that if the number of respondents indicating a desire to leave politics was sufficiently large we would be able to examine in some detail what factors, if any, help to account for their decision to leave federal politics. But the number who said that they definitely would not run again was very low: only five respondents said that they would not run for Parliament again, and a further ten stated that they were not sure. The number of (possibly) "disenchanted" was too small to justify detailed analysis of factors influencing their decisions; but a few observations are worth making. French-speaking M.P.s were far more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to say that they would be running again: no French-speaking M.P. said definitely that he was not running again, and only three said they were not sure. Among English-speaking M.P.s, on the other hand, five said they were leaving federal politics and ten said they did not know whether or not they would run again. Urban M.P.s were less inclined to say they would definitely run, and this difference was not accounted for by differences between the parties: Liberals, more of whom come from the urban areas, were no less inclined than Conservatives to say they would run again. Only the Cr ditistes were unanimously agreed that they would run again. There is also a regional variation worth noting: M.P.s from British Columbia and the Maritimes were less inclined than the others to say they would run again, with M.P.s from British Columbia being



the least inclined to say that they would contest further elections.<sup>4</sup>

To help further our understanding of M.P.s' orientation to federal politics, we asked all respondents who said that they were intending to run again why they were planning to do so. Overall, the most important single explanation of why the M.P. intended to run again (we coded as many as three reasons for each respondent) was the simple statement, "I enjoy the life": 42.4% of all respondents gave this answer. The next most important reason given was that the M.P. felt that he should carry on and try to finish the job which he began when he decided to enter federal politics. Twenty-five per cent mentioned (often in addition to another explanation) that they wanted to continue serving the public; nearly 15% stated specifically that they thought they could now use their experience to better advantage and wanted a further opportunity to do so. Finally there were a number of additional reasons given (classed in the table below as "other") which reflect, generally, secondary and tertiary considerations accounting for Members' desire to run again for Parliament.

Several M.P.s were remarkably frank in discussing "other reasons" why they would continue to run for Parliament: four admitted that they would be unemployable otherwise; six (five of them English-speaking) said that they enjoyed elections and especially defeating their opponents; six said that they thought it was expected of them; three said that it furthered their personal ambitions; three said that they were staying for the pension; one said he was running again through sheer "inertia"; and another said he was running "for family reasons".

---

<sup>4</sup> Overall, 84.6% said they would run again; only 63.6% of M.P.s from British Columbia said they would run again.



Variations in responses were observable on the basis of all four major variables of analysis, but the major distinction was between M.P.s of the two principal language groups: French-speaking M.P.s were very much more inclined to say that they were running again to "finish the job they began", whereas English-speaking M.P.s were far more inclined to say that they were running again because they "like the life". Apart from these two principal explanations, there were no differences between the two language groups (except the one noted above in the discussion of "other" reasons).

Table 6.1

Reasons for Running Again for Parliament, Offered by English and French-Speaking M.P.s Who Said That They Definitely Would be Running for Parliament Again (horizontal %)\*

	want to finish job	enjoy life	use experience to better advantage	serve public	other
English	18.5	50.8	15.4	26.2	30.8
French	50.0	26.5	11.8	23.5	20.6
All M.P.s	29.3	42.4	14.1	25.3	27.3

\* totals more than 100% because M.P.s mentioned more than one reason.

Generally speaking, the differences between the parties follow the lines of the dichotomy between the principal language groups. The differences between the English-speaking Conservatives and English-speaking Liberals are less than the differences within the parties between the M.P.s





from the two principal language groups. Even so, English-speaking Liberals are a little more inclined to say that they want to "finish the job" and English-speaking Conservatives are a little more inclined to say that they wish to "continue serving the public". Both are equally inclined to say that they "enjoy the life"; neither is as disposed to mention this reason as Members of the New Democratic Party. Cr ditistes are most inclined to say that they want to "finish the job". Further, there is a variation between the responses of M.P.s, depending on the location of their constituencies, that cannot be explained by the influence of one or other of the parties or the language differences noted: M.P.s from the mixed-urban-rural constituencies are most inclined to say that they wish to continue serving the public and are least inclined to say that they want to "finish the job". Finally, when the responses are examined in regional terms, a few interesting facts emerge. Prairie M.P.s, M.P.s for British Columbia, and Maritime M.P.s are far less inclined to say that they want to "finish the job". It is really only among Quebec and Ontario M.P.s that this response was of significance: 86% of the references to this reason for running again for Parliament came from M.P.s from the two central provinces of Canada, especially, as we noted, from M.P.s from Quebec. Ontario M.P.s were also most disposed to say that they wished to use their experience to further advantage.

In order to try to understand better what is appealing about being an M.P. we asked all respondents: "If for some reason you had to give up being an M.P. today, what would you miss the most?" Some respondents mentioned more than one thing they would miss, but the most prominent reply was this: "I would miss the feeling of being at the centre of things". Overall, 37.3% mentioned this reason, and a further 26.3% mentioned the closely related reason that they would miss the constantly interesting or



exciting life. Some M.P.s linked the two reasons in their replies. Twenty-six per cent of the respondents said they would miss their good friends; and 18% said they would miss the "opportunity to serve in a public capacity". In addition, a few M.P.s mentioned a variety of answers which we have classified as "others" in the table below. Eight M.P.s said they would miss the House of Commons; four said they would miss the prestige of the job; two said they would regret not having done more; two thought they would miss the intellectual stimulation of discussion with colleagues; two said they would miss the opportunity to influence public affairs; and one said that he would miss being able to travel around the constituency. Finally, nearly eight per cent of the M.P.s interviewed said that they would not miss anything at all if they left the parliamentary scene immediately.

On this particular question we compared responses only on the basis of the M.P.'s principal language group, and found differences in the most significant areas: French-speaking M.P.s were a little more inclined to say that there was nothing that they would miss if they left the House of Commons; and French-speaking M.P.s were a little less inclined to say that they enjoyed "being at the centre of things" and would miss the exciting life. Otherwise there were no significant differences in their responses.

Generally, it may be observed that although many Canadian backbench M.P.s appeared to be somewhat reluctantly recruited to politics in the first place, most of them were able to discover reasons for wanting to stay. Not many M.P.s, at any rate, were thoroughly disenchanted with their lot. On the other hand, it must also be observed that the reasons that many gave for wanting to stay on in their positions, and the aspects of parliamentary life that many said would be missed most, hardly reflect the ideals normally held up by the average newspaper editorial or high school civics text.





Table 6.2

Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s to:  
 "If for Some Reason You Had to Give Up Being an M.P. Today,  
 What Would You Miss the Most?"\*

	<u>% English mentioning reason</u>	<u>% French mentioning reason</u>
would not miss anything	5.0	13.5
would miss feeling of being at the centre of things	40.0	32.4
would miss constantly interesting/exciting life	28.8	21.6
would miss good friends	26.3	27.0
would miss the opportunity to serve in a public capacity	18.8	18.9
would miss other things	16.3	13.5

\* % totals more than 100% because some M.P.s mentioned more than one factor.

How many backbench M.P.s, we may ask, have aspirations for some higher involvement in Canadian politics? How many in particular would like, someday, to advance to participation in politics at the cabinet level? Given the low level of self-generated involvement in a political career that seems common among the bulk of our backbench respondents, we might reasonably expect that not many would be particularly interested in further public office, and this is essentially the case. When we asked all our backbench respondents whether there were "any public office you would like to seek sometime in the future" only 24.0% indicated that they would be interested in a cabinet post at some time in the future; 49.6% said they had no interest



in any public office(s) in future; and 25.2% said that some other public office would suit them if it came their way. Four backbenchers said they would like to be parliamentary secretaries; two said they would prefer to be in a provincial rather than a federal cabinet; six said they would be pleased with a judicial appointment; six stated that elevation to the Senate would be appreciated; two said they would like to be ambassadors; and one said he would be very happy to be an ordinary M.P. in a party in power for a change.<sup>5</sup>

Even if we assumed that every respondent who stated that he would be interested in further public office, but who refused to specify what office(s) he meant (10% of the sample), was in fact interested in becoming a cabinet minister someday, we still have a remarkably small number of backbench M.P.s committed to participation in politics at a high level. Half our respondents stated flatly that they are uninterested in higher public office. On the most generous assumption possible, only about a third of the backbenchers are interested in cabinet office. Is it any wonder that when Canadian Prime Ministers set about to construct their cabinets they tend to rely so largely on men recruited directly to high political office from either business or the civil service, and without prior experience of Parliament?<sup>6</sup> Without keen

---

<sup>5</sup>Some respondents mentioned more than one public office they would like to seek sometime, but we have counted them only once in the figure of 25.2% given above, since we are not concerned with how many offices they would like, but whether they would like any at all. In the enumeration of the "other public offices" sought, we took account of all references to the office.

<sup>6</sup>See Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, pp. 398-415.



competition for political office among those with experience on the backbenches of the House of Commons, it is only natural for Prime Ministers to go outside Parliament in the difficult task of cabinet construction in a federal system.<sup>7</sup>

It is tempting to conclude, recalling that the self-recruited backbenchers discussed in an earlier chapter constituted roughly one-quarter of the backbench respondents, that these are the same men who indicate a willingness to serve in a cabinet post. Here, we might conclude, is the essential Canadian political animal, the highly motivated, politically ambitious politician. The statistics do not confirm such a simple theory. "Self-recruiters" are indeed more inclined than M.P.s recruited by any other method to say that they would like to achieve cabinet office someday, but they are not much more disposed to say so. "Self-recruiters" represent 25% of the backbench respondents and 36.7% of the M.P.s stating that they would like to seek cabinet office; "conscripted" M.P.s represent 37.7% of the total backbench respondents, but only 30% of the cabinet seekers; "coopted" M.P.s represent 27.9% of the total respondents and only 23.3% of the cabinet seekers.

---

7

We asked respondents about their attitude to parliamentary experience as a prerequisite to cabinet office by inviting them to agree or disagree with the statement that: "Experience on the back-benches is absolutely essential before a man should be given a cabinet post." 72.4% of the respondents agreed with the statement; 21.9% disagreed and 5.7% were not sure. There was no difference between the responses of English and French-speaking respondents overall, although French-speaking Liberals were a little more inclined to agree than English-speaking Liberals. Conservative M.P.s were the most inclined to agree with the statement (only three Prairie Conservatives out of all the Conservatives who responded to the statements disagreed with it). New Democrats (55.6%) and Cr ditistes (16.7%) were least inclined to agree. Among the Liberals, M.P.s from Ontario were the least inclined to agree. In regional terms, M.P.s from the Maritimes were most inclined to agree (not one said he disagreed and only one said he was not sure); between the other regions there were no significant differences in the responses at all.





In short, self-recruitment is positively related to the M.P.'s disposition to seek further office in the form of a cabinet post, but self-recruiters are not more inclined to seek cabinet office than the more "passive" recruits.

When we look at the responses in terms of the respondents' principal language group and party, we find that these are better indicators of the disposition to seek further public office generally than the method of recruitment. As far as cabinet office-seeking is concerned there are no differences overall between the two principal language groups, but English-speaking M.P.s are more inclined than French-speaking M.P.s to say that they seek no public offices whatever: by implication, French-speaking M.P.s are more disposed to say that they would like, someday, to receive further public offices other than a cabinet post.

Table 6.3

Responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s:

"Are There Any Public Offices You Would Like to Seek

Some Time in the Future?" (horizontal %)

	<u>no public offices sought</u>	<u>would like a cabinet post</u>	<u>would like some other public office</u>
English	54.4	25.3	20.5
French	38.9	27.8	36.1
N =	57	30	29

To a great extent, however, the differences between the two principal language groups are determined by a fundamental difference between English and French-speaking Liberals. English-speaking Liberals are more inclined



than French-speaking Liberals to say that they seek no public offices, but they are slightly more inclined to say that they seek a cabinet post. The major difference between the two groups of Liberals, and this is the difference which reflects itself in the fundamental difference between the two language groups generally (brought out in the table above), is the far greater disposition of French-speaking Liberals to say that they seek further public office (other than a cabinet office): 41.7% of the French-speaking Liberals stated that they would seek such an office, as compared with only 19.4% of the English-speaking Liberals. Putting the same facts in a slightly different way, French-speaking Liberals alone account for 83.3% of the French-speaking respondents' references to seeking an office other than a cabinet office, and 34.5% of all references to the matter.

When we examine the responses by party we encounter differences in the disposition to mention seeking a cabinet office. Liberals (31.6%) are the most disposed to mention cabinet-seeking and Conservatives (only 17.1%) are the least disposed. Two New Democrats, one Social Crediter and two Cr ditistes also mentioned seeking cabinet office someday. As far as the disposition to seek other public office is concerned there are no real differences between the parties, apart from the fact that the Liberals (here mainly the French-speaking Liberals) are most disposed to seek such offices. The regional and urban/rural variations are very much tied up with the analysis already presented: Ontario and Quebec M.P.s (from areas of Liberal strength) are most disposed to say they seek a cabinet career; M.P.s from B.C. and the Maritimes are least inclined to say they seek cabinet office.

Three general conclusions suggest themselves from the foregoing analysis: disposition to seek further public office is closely related to the possession of power by one's party at the moment, but it is also related





to "self-recruitment" in politics (it must be recorded that there were no differences between Conservatives and Liberals in the number of self-recruited M.P.s); French-speaking M.P.s, especially, are most disposed to hope that the fruits of victory will end in reward for themselves in some kind of public office other than cabinet; and finally, even within the government party, among M.P.s for whom the prospect of higher public office must certainly be regarded as more concrete, the number of men disposed to seek further public office is surprisingly few.

In order to try to discover the less congenial aspects of being an M.P. we asked all respondents, immediately after putting the question about what they would miss most if they left Parliament immediately, what they would miss least. Possibly because the question was put late in the interview, when respondents were beginning to tire, or possibly because they could not think of any response, the number of "no answers" was high: nearly 25% made no reply, and a further nearly five per cent said that there was nothing they could think of that they would be pleased to have done with. Moreover, among those who did answer there seemed to be few factors which emerge as generally uncongenial. We received such a great variety of responses to this question that it became virtually impossible to analyse the attitudes of respondents in terms of any generalized complaints about parliamentary life. We content ourselves here, therefore, with merely presenting the range of responses received.<sup>8</sup> The one single advantage foreseen most by respondents (24 M.P.s) as following their sudden departure from federal politics, was the chance to spend more time with their families; sixteen M.P.s mentioned that they would be glad to have done with the endless debates in the House of Commons;

---

<sup>8</sup>Several M.P.s who did reply gave more than one response to the question.



fifteen also mentioned that they would be pleased not to have to endure the constant travel back and forth from their constituencies to Ottawa; eleven said they would not miss the loss of private life; eleven said they would be glad to have put an end to the "pestering requests" they receive from their constituents and others; nine M.P.s said that they would be glad not to have to stay in Ottawa; five said they would not miss the longer hours; six said they would be pleased to get away from the "politicking and back-biting" that goes on in Parliament; four said they would be relieved to stop losing money; three said they would enjoy an end to the uncertainty of political life; three said they would appreciate an end to the unsettledness of their working conditions (the hours and length of session); two said they would be glad to escape the need to fight elections; and one M.P. said that he would enjoy not having to face criticism.

The fact that only four respondents volunteered the response that they would be pleased to put an end to losing money if they departed suddenly from Parliament is significant in the light of answers received to two further questions which we put to all respondents. During the course of the interview we asked all backbench M.P.s: "Do you think one loses money in politics, even if one wins the election and gets the indemnity?", and in Part B of the questionnaire we invited all respondents to agree or disagree with the proposition that: "M.P.s, in view of the demands made upon them, are chronically underpaid."

Although a number of M.P.s admitted that the situation was better as a result of the recent substantial increase in their indemnities, the vast majority of Canadian M.P.s nevertheless expressed the belief that one loses money in politics as an incumbent: 67.6% stated that M.P.s lose money in politics; 20.7% said that some do, some do not; and only 11.7% stated that



M.P.s do not lose money. The responses vary between the respondents, especially on the basis of principal language group and region, and within the parties.<sup>9</sup>

French-speaking Liberals and Conservatives are especially inclined to say that they lose money in politics, whereas not one Cr ditiste said that M.P.s definitely lose money (80% of the Cr ditistes replied that some do, some do not). If one compares only the English-speaking respondents, one finds that English-speaking Liberals are a little more inclined than English-speaking Conservatives to think that the M.P. loses money in politics, but both are less inclined than New Democrats (75.0%) to say that one loses money in politics. Because of the concentration of French-speaking Liberals in Quebec, one would expect a regional variation in the sense that more Quebec M.P.s than any other region's M.P.s might be disposed to say that the M.P. loses money in politics. However, this is not the case. The fact that Cr ditistes, also from Quebec, disagree with the suggestion that M.P.s necessarily lose money in politics, and the fact that M.P.s in Ontario and the Maritimes are very much disposed to say that they lose money in politics, results in the observation that Quebec M.P.s are actually a little less inclined than M.P.s from either the Maritimes or Ontario to say that the M.P. loses money in politics. Within Ontario, there appears to be no significant difference in the responses of M.P.s from the two major parties on this question; but among Maritime M.P.s there is a sharp difference between the two major parties. Although English-speaking Conservatives generally are a

---

<sup>9</sup> There are no significant variations on the basis of the location of the constituency.





little less disposed than English-speaking Liberals and New Democrats to say that the M.P. loses money in politics, among the Maritime Conservatives there is unanimity that the M.P. loses money in politics. In the figures presented in the table below it must be appreciated, therefore, that it is only Liberals in the Maritimes who are disposed to say either that the M.P. does not lose money or that only some do. There are further regional variations worth noting. If Maritime Conservatives are fully disposed to the notion that M.P.s lose money in politics and Conservatives in Ontario are no less inclined to agree than Liberals in Ontario, from where does the difference between Conservatives and Liberals overall spring? The answer is that Prairie Conservatives are considerably less inclined than all other M.P.s (except Cr ditistes) to say that the M.P. loses money in politics: only 46.7% of the Prairie Conservatives agreed that M.P.s do lose money; 29.4% said that they do not; and 23.5% said that some do and some do not.

Table 6.4

Responses of Backbench M.P.s to: "Do You Think that One  
Loses Money in Politics, Even if One Wins the Election and  
Gets the Indemnity?"

a) By Principal Language Group Within the Liberal and Conservative  
Parties

	<u>% Liberals</u>		<u>% Conservatives</u>	
	<u>English</u>	<u>French</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>French</u>
lose money in politics	63.6	91.7	60.6	100.0
do not lose money in politics	6.1	4.2	18.2	0.0
some lose money some do not	<u>30.3</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>0.0</u>
N =	33	24	33	2



b) By Region (All Parties) - (horizontal %)

	<u>lose money in politics</u>	<u>do not lose money in politics</u>	<u>some lose money, some do not</u>
B.C./Yukon	63.6	27.3	9.1
Prairies/NWT	47.1	29.4	23.5
Ontario	73.5	2.9	23.5
Quebec	70.6	5.9	23.5
Maritimes	73.3	13.3*	13.3*

\* all Liberals

There are at least three major factors determining the M.P.'s judgment as to whether or not he loses money in politics. The first is the salary which he would have earned in private life: many lawyers, doctors, other professionals, and business men take a loss of annual income by becoming M.P.s, especially if they regard the job (as most appear to do) as a full-time occupation.<sup>10</sup>

Secondly, it depends on the size of the M.P.'s family, whether or not he has had to try to find a second home for his family in Ottawa, and what implications moving has had for education costs, etc. And finally, whether or not an M.P. loses money in politics may be related to the kinds of demands which are put on him by his constituents. The fact that the regional pattern of responses to the question of whether or not an M.P. loses money in politics bears a close relationship to the regional pattern discovered earlier in attitudes of constituents in different parts of the

---

<sup>10</sup> It might be suggested that, since many Cr ditistes did not come to Parliament from high income occupations, this, in part, accounts for their beliefs that the M.P. does not necessarily lose money in politics.





country towards the job of M.P. may not be altogether accidental. It does appear, in the table below, that M.P.s from the "newer provinces" (the Prairies and B.C.), where constituents seem less interested in the patronage aspects of the job, are more inclined to say that M.P.s do not lose money in politics.

Table 6.5

Comparison of Responses of Backbench M.P.s, by Regions,  
Showing the Relationship Between Attitudes of Constituents  
Towards the Job and the M.P.'s Belief That One Loses Money in Politics

	% M.P.s agree that constituents are always asking M.P.s to do something un- related to their federal positions	% M.P.s agree that their con- stituents are more interested in the welfare services they can perform than in legislation	% M.P.s receiv- ing job- seeking letters	% M.P.s say- ing that one does not lose money in politics
B.C./Yukon	36.4	45.5	0.0	27.3
Prairies/N.W.T.	46.2	38.5	11.7	29.4
Ontario	66.7	54.5	20.5	2.9
Quebec	91.2	78.8	63.9	5.9
Maritimes	71.4	66.7	62.9	13.3

There is, also, a relationship between whether the M.P. thinks that one loses money in politics and whether the M.P. thinks that M.P.s are chronically underpaid, but the relationship is not as strong as one might expect it to be: 67.6% of all respondents stated that one loses money in politics, but of these only 36.8% said that they agreed that the M.P. is chronically underpaid; 56% of those who apparently feel that the



M.P. loses money in politics nevertheless disagreed with the suggestion that he was underpaid, and 7.4% were not sure. There was, however, a clear relationship between those who thought that the M.P. does not lose money and those who disagreed with the suggestion that the M.P. is chronically underpaid: only one respondent in this position felt that the M.P. was, nevertheless, chronically underpaid. Interestingly, those who said in reply to the earlier question that "some M.P.s lose money, some do not" were as disposed as those who said that the M.P. definitely loses money to affirm that the M.P. is chronically underpaid.

Table 6.6

Comparison of Responses to the Question of Whether  
Or Not One Loses Money in Politics With Responses  
To The Question of Whether or Not M.P.s Are  
Chronically Underpaid (All Respondents)

	<u>% respondents who agree that M.P. is chroni- cally underpaid</u>	<u>% of respondents who disagree that M.P.s are chronically underpaid</u>	<u>% not sure</u>
those who say that one loses money in politics	36.8	55.9	7.4
those who say that one does not lose money in politics	9.1	90.9	0.0
those who say that some lose, some do not	36.4	54.5	9.1
N =	34	60	7



Because there is no direct relationship between thinking that one loses money in politics and thinking that the M.P. is chronically underpaid (even though there is a positive relationship between disagreeing with the two propositions), we need not necessarily expect that responses to the question of whether or not M.P.s are underpaid will follow exactly the same patterns as those exhibited in response to the previous question, and indeed they do not. However, it is interesting to observe that the bulk of the dichotomy, between the position of those who say that one loses money in politics but nevertheless disagree that M.P.s are chronically underpaid, is accounted for by English-speaking M.P.s who agree with the first proposition but disagree with the second. Not every French-speaking M.P. who said that one loses money in politics also said that he feels that M.P.s are chronically underpaid, but French-speaking M.P.s, particularly the Liberals, were much more consistent in their answers to the two questions. On the other hand, the Cr ditistes, not one of whom said definitely that M.P.s lose money in politics, were evenly divided between those who said that the M.P. is underpaid and those who said that he is not.

Table 6.7

English and French-Speaking M.P.s' Responses To:

"M.P.s, in View of the Demands Made Upon Them,

Are Chronically Underpaid" (horizontal %)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
English	21.6	71.6	6.8
French	<u>58.8</u>	<u>35.3</u>	<u>5.9</u>
N =	36	65	7





Table 6.8

Comparison of French and English-speaking  
Liberals on the Question of Whether or Not  
One Loses Money in Politics and Whether or  
Not M.P.s Are Chronically Underpaid\*

	<u>% saying M.P. loses</u>	<u>% saying M.P. is underpaid</u>	<u>% saying M.P. does not lose money</u>	<u>% saying M.P. not underpaid</u>
English- speaking Liberals	63.6	25.0	6.1	66.7
French- speaking Liberals	91.7	68.2	4.2	22.7

\* "not sures" are excluded

There was also a measure of consistency in the responses of Prairie M.P.s: they were the most inclined to say that the M.P. does not lose money in politics, and the most inclined to disagree with the suggestion that M.P.s are chronically underpaid. What of the M.P.s in the other regions? Knowing what we do about the responses of French-speaking M.P.s, we would expect a higher degree of consistency between the responses of Quebec M.P.s on the two questions, and this in fact is the case. It may be recalled that Ontario and Maritimes M.P.s (in addition to those from Quebec) had agreed that one loses money in politics. Obviously, the M.P.s from these two regions changed their tunes on the question of the M.P.'s being underpaid. The difference in responses between the two questions is particularly striking among Maritime Conservatives: every respondent



had earlier said that the M.P. loses money in politics, but in answer to the question about the adequacy of the M.P.'s indemnity, only one said that he thought that the M.P. is chronically underpaid.

Table 6.9

Comparison of M.P.s From the Different Regions on  
the Question of Whether or Not One Loses Money in  
Politics and Whether or Not M.P.s are Chronically Underpaid\*

	<u>% saying M.P. loses money</u>	<u>% saying M.P. underpaid</u>	<u>% saying M.P. does not lose money</u>	<u>% saying M. not underp</u>
B.C./Yukon	63.6	27.3	27.3	72.7
Prairies/NWT	47.1	7.1	29.4	84.6
Ontario	73.5	31.4	2.9	62.9
Quebec	70.6	52.9	5.9	38.2
Maritimes	73.6	20.0	13.3	73.3

\* "not sures" are excluded

When we compare the responses of English-speaking M.P.s on the question of whether or not M.P.s are underpaid, we find no difference between Liberals and Conservatives. The two English-speaking Social Crediters whom we interviewed both disagreed with the suggestion that M.P.s were underpaid, and eight of the nine New Democrats interviewed disagreed. When one compares these responses with those on the question of whether or not one loses money in politics, it is obviously the New Democrats whose answers are most widely divergent on the two questions.

Fundamentally, the main point to arise from this analysis of the cost of a political career and the indemnity that M.P.s should receive is





the clear dichotomy between the position of the English and French-speaking M.P.s. Both groups agree that M.P.s lose money in politics. French-speaking M.P.s take the consistent view that therefore M.P.s are underpaid; the majority of English-speaking M.P.s, on the other hand, seem to feel that the indemnity is sufficient (for the moment?) and that losing money is one of the consequences of public service in a political career. French-speaking respondents may also have reacted particularly favourably to the suggestion in the proposition that, "in view of the demands made upon them", M.P.s' indemnities are too low. French-speaking M.P.s (particularly, it must be recalled, Quebec Liberals), emphasized on several occasions the patronage-seeking of their constituents. But so did Maritime M.P.s.

Finally we come to the analysis of the question which caused considerable controversy in the course of interviewing members: the point in Part B of the questionnaire at which we invited respondents to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that "Politics is a dirty game". The statement was included in the study, along with a number of others, in order to provide one dimension for judging the orientation of Canadian M.P.s towards the political process. The man-on-the-street comment that politics is a dirty game is familiar enough. We were particularly interested in trying to discover if those M.P.s who said that they would no longer be running for Parliament were any more inclined to agree with it than those who were staying on. We have already seen enough about the recruitment process in Canada to appreciate that there are a number of men attracted into the political process in Ottawa without much prior interest in, or experience of, politics; and it would be interesting to know whether they are at all disillusioned with what they found when they got



there. Such was the rationale for the inclusion of the statement in our list of thirty propositions to which M.P.s could indicate their agreement or disagreement. Now that the results of the analysis are available it is easy to conclude that it might have been better to have omitted the question; at least we can say that given the data we have to work with there is not much we can make of the results we received with regard to this particular statement of attitude.

In the first place the number of respondents who indicated that they would not (or might not) be running again for Parliament was small: only 15 respondents fell within this category. In the second place, the number of respondents who agreed that politics is a dirty game was also relatively small: only 17.1% of the respondents indicated that they agreed or tended to agree with the statement. Consequently when one comes to distribute this small number of responses among different sets of variables, the number of responses within each category is normally so small that one cannot be confident of the results. Moreover, the matter is slightly complicated further by the fact that 17 of the 122 respondents refused to respond to the statement in question. Nevertheless, because of the controversy surrounding the question in the first place, we feel that it is worthwhile to present the results as they have emerged, being careful to warn that the numbers involved (despite the large sample from which we are working) make it unwise to attribute too much finality to the results.

First it is worth emphasizing that there is hardly any difference between the responses of those interviewed before the "crisis" as compared with those afterwards; in contrast to the reaction to the question of whether or not there is a problem of communication between English and French Canadians (dealt with in Chapter Seven), there seems to have been



no particular effort on the part of "post-crisis" respondents to deny that politics is a dirty game. It is true that the percentage of those interviewed after the crisis agreeing that politics is a dirty game is slightly smaller than the percentage agreeing among those interviewed before the crisis; but the difference is statistically insignificant at the 95% level of probability.

Table 6.10

Responses of Backbench M.P.s Interviewed Before the  
Crisis Compared with Those Interviewed After the  
Crisis on the Statement: "Politics is a Dirty  
Game". (horizontal %)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>	<u>N</u>
interviewed before crisis	21.1	75.4	3.5	57
interviewed after crisis	12.5	85.4	2.1	48
All respondents	17.1	80.0	2.9	
N =	18	84	3	105

$$\chi^2 = 1.62$$

significant at less than 60% (frequencies low)

Interestingly, there is even less variation between those who say they plan to run again for Parliament and those who do not plan to (or are





not sure they will) run again.<sup>11</sup> Nor is there any significant relationship between the method of recruitment to politics and one's position on the statement. Co-opted M.P.s are a little more inclined to agree with the statement than others, but the differences are too small to be called significant.<sup>12</sup> Party, urban/rural location of constituency, mother tongue and age taken separately do not seem to show any positive relationships either, but when these variables are looked at together some differences do emerge. When the responses are compared between the two principal language groups, French-speaking M.P.s are slightly less inclined to say that politics is a dirty game, but the differences between French and English-speaking M.P.s overall are not great: 21.5% of the English-speaking M.P.s agree that politics is a dirty game, whereas only 8.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s think so. But these differences are all the more important when one notes that every single Liberal disagreed with the suggestion; two Cr ditistes and one French-speaking Social Credit M.P. account for all the agreement with the proposition among French-speaking M.P.s. On the other hand, there are no significant differences between the English-speaking respondents in terms of party: English-speaking Liberals are slightly more inclined to disagree with the statement, but the differences are too slight to make anything of them. When one puts the English and French-speaking

---

<sup>11</sup> 80.2% of those who plan to run again disagree with the proposition and 81.3% of those who do not or don't know whether they will run again disagree.

<sup>12</sup> 23.6% of the co-opted M.P.s agree that politics is a dirty game, compared to 14.3% of the self-recruited M.P.s, 15% of the conscripted M.P.s and 18.2% of those whose method of recruitment was uncertain to us (but whom we knew were not self-recruited).



respondents together and analyses the results by party, differences do appear. The Liberals (thanks to the 100% disagreement of the French-speaking M.P.s) are the least inclined to agree with the statement; Conservatives and New Democrats are roughly in the same position as the English-speaking Liberals; and the Cr ditistes and Social Credit M.P.s are more inclined than any other to say that politics is a dirty game.

Table 6.11

Responses of Backbench M.P.s to the Statement That

"Politics is a Dirty Game", by Party

(horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	10.7	89.3	0.0
Conservatives	20.7	75.9	3.4
New Democrats	25.0	75.0	0.0
Social Credit	40.0	40.0	20.1
Cr�ditistes	33.3	50.0	16.7

Comparison of the responses of all respondents in terms of the urban/rural variable does not reveal any relationship between location of constituency and position on this question; but when we look separately at the responses of M.P.s within the two major parties the reason for this fact emerges: within the Conservative Party all those who agree with the statement come from rural constituencies, whereas within the Liberal Party two-thirds of those who agree with the statement come from the urban areas. When the parties are combined in one table the differences are cancelled



out.

When we analyzed the responses in terms of the ages of the respondents, it was difficult to come to firm conclusions because the numbers of responses in each cell were so small. All we can say with any certainty about the relationship of age to attitude is that, within the Liberal Party, not one M.P. in the under-34 age group agreed that politics is a dirty game; on the other hand older M.P.s were not notably more inclined to agree than those in the middle-age groups. Within the Conservative party, where there are no under-34's in our sample, the same comparison cannot be made. Here, however, the over-45's were more inclined to agree with the statement than those in the 35 to 44 age group. By and large, regional variations are accounted for by the party and especially language variables already examined. Ontario M.P.s (24.2%) were the most inclined to agree with the suggestion that politics is a dirty game. Every Maritime M.P. disagreed with the statement.

But the best single indicator of agreement with the proposition has been reserved to the last, and the fact that it is the best indicator helps throw light on why this particular question received so much attention from M.P.s and the press. As will be indicated in the following chapter, at one point in the interview we asked all English-speaking respondents whether their general attitude towards French Canadians had changed since they became M.P.s. We were able to discover in this manner the number of respondents who had become (or always were) unsympathetic towards French Canadians. Significantly, the proportions of those who are (or have always been) unsympathetic towards French Canadians, and who also think that politics is a dirty game, is considerably higher than those English-speaking M.P.s who are sympathetic towards French Canadians.





Table 6.12

Responses of English-Speaking M.P.s Who Are Sympathetic and Unsympathetic Towards French Canadians on the Question of Whether Politics is a Dirty Game (horizontal %)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
sympathetic to French Canadians	13.2	86.8	0.0
unsympathetic to French Canadians	37.5	56.3	6.1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	13	55	1

$$\chi^2 = 8.60$$

significant at 97.5% +

The analysis which set out to explore the relationship between the M.P.'s general attitude to "the game of politics" and the method of recruitment to politics, desire to continue in politics, and other variables such as party, region, and mother tongue, clearly did not turn up with results that one can interpret with any confidence. Although lack of sympathy with French Canadians cannot be made to account for the entire lot of respondents who agree that politics is a dirty game, it certainly appears significant among English-speaking respondents. Given that our survey took place at a time when the Dorion inquiry focused national attention on the political morals of, especially, French Canadian M.P.s, and given the fact that those who appear unsympathetic towards French Canadians are more disposed to say that politics is a dirty game, we may perhaps assume that in calmer times the number of Canadian M.P.s who would agree that



politics is a dirty game would loom less large. Our statement in practice did not get at M.P.s' general responses to the question of whether or not politics is a dirty game: most of them reacted to the statement in terms of the political events of the moment. The truth of this assertion is confirmed as much by the unanimous disagreement with the proposition on the part of the French-speaking Liberals, as it is by the propensity for those English-speaking M.P.s who are unsympathetic to French Canadians to agree with it.

## 11. General Attitudes Towards Parliament

Midway through the interview with a respondent we asked him, more as a way of leading into other questions than for the intrinsic value of his answers: "As you see it; what role should the House of Commons play in our governmental system?" Essentially most M.P.s agreed (although they took different routes to say the same thing) that, as L.S. Amery once put it, the task of the House of Commons is to ventilate not to legislate. Members recognized the formal legislative aspects of the Common's work, but they did not imagine, by and large, that it is a forum for legislative initiative. Not every Member put forward this interpretation of the status of the House of Commons, but three-quarters of all respondents agreed with proposition (put to them in Part B of the questionnaire) that "Our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation."

The fact that not all agreed with this obvious circumstance of Canadian parliamentary life makes it worthwhile to try to discover whether there are significant variations in the pattern of responses. Generally speaking there is only one significant variable: party. When we examined



the results by representational role, purposive role, and urban/rural location of constituencies, there were no significant differences. When responses are compared between the two principal language groups, it appears that these differences may be slightly important (French-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to agree), but when one looks at the results by party (controlled for language group) one finds that the differences are really caused by party differences. There is no difference between English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals, but both groups of Liberals are more inclined to disagree with the proposition than Cr ditistes and Social Crediters. The real differences are between the latter two parties and the Conservatives; although a bare majority of Conservatives agree that "our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation", Conservatives are more inclined to disagree with the statement than M.P.s from any other party. What appears to be a slightly more predominant degree of agreement with the suggestion on the part of French-speaking M.P.s is accounted for by the unanimous agreement of the Cr ditistes.

These party differences resulted in a regional variation that was to be expected: Prairie M.P.s were most inclined to disagree with the suggestion, and Quebec M.P.s were most inclined to agree. There was, however, one further regional variation worth mentioning: Ontario Liberals were more inclined than Liberals from any other region in the country to disagree with the proposition.

We then asked all respondents: "How effective is the House of Commons in fulfilling the role you think it should play". Sixty-two per cent of the M.P.s said that it is effective; 37.9% said it is not very





Table 6.13

Responses, by Party, of Backbench M.P.s  
to: "Our Parliamentary System Assumes That  
Backbenchers Will Play a Minor Role in Framing Legislation" (horizontal %)  
(independents omitted)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	78.0	20.3	1.7
Conservatives	58.6	41.4	0.0
New Democrats	77.8	22.2	0.0
Social Credit	100.0	0.0	0.0
Créditistes	100.0	0.0	0.0
N =	82	26	1

effective.<sup>13</sup> It would not be unreasonable to expect that the pattern of responses might follow that indicated above. Surprisingly, however, it did not. Instead of discovering that Conservatives, possibly frustrated by the gap between belief and reality, are predominantly of the opinion that the House of Commons is ineffective in its role, we find that it is predominantly French Canadians, and particularly the Créditistes, who feel that the House of Commons is not effective. When the results are analysed by party (and controlled for principal language group) we find that there are no differences between the responses of English-speaking Liberals and

---

<sup>13</sup> Roughly two-thirds of those classified here as saying that the House of Commons is effective admitted that there is room for improvement.



English-speaking Conservatives. New Democrats are about as inclined to disagree as French-speaking Liberals (who divide equally on the matter). Essentially, then, there are two factors influencing one's feelings about the effectiveness of the House of Commons: minor party M.P.s are more critical than those from the major parties, and French-speaking M.P.s are more critical than English-speaking M.P.s.

Table 6.14

Judgement of Effectiveness of the House of Commons by  
English and French-Speaking M.P.s (horizontal %)

	<u>thinks that the House of Commons is effective in fulfilling the role it should play</u>	<u>thinks that the House of Commons is not very effective in fulfilling the role it should play</u>
English	69.9	30.1
French	42.4	57.9
	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	72	44

The combination of the differences based on principal language group and minor party position confused the regional pattern of variation; but it is interesting to note that M.P.s from Ontario were most inclined to say that the House of Commons is effective: 80% of the Ontario respondents indicated their satisfaction with the effectiveness of the House of Commons. Finally we may observe the variations when we arrayed the response in terms of the representational roles of respondents: Trustees (drawn almost equally from both principal language groups) and Mixed Types (rather more predominant among French-speaking Liberals) were a little more inclined



than Constituency Delegates to say that the House of Commons is ineffective. Interestingly, however, Party Delegates were considerably more inclined than others to say that they thought the House of Commons is effective in fulfilling its role: 80% of the Party Delegates as compared with only 53.7% of the Mixed Types said that they thought the Commons is effective.

After respondents had been given opportunity to develop their views on the effectiveness of the House of Commons, we asked those who had not indicated complete conviction in its effectiveness: "What are the most pressing problems which prevent the House of Commons from doing what you think it ought to be doing?" Considering the difference between the two principal language groups on the question of the House of Commons' effectiveness, we might have expected more exciting differences in the factors selected as "pressing problems" preventing the House of Commons from doing its job adequately. But it is interesting that, generally speaking, French-speaking M.P.s had fewer remarks to make about specific problems, and when they did note problems they revealed no great differences from those selected by English-speaking M.P.s.

English-speaking respondents are more inclined to say that there are no pressing problems (even though they think that there is room for improvement in the effectiveness of the House of Commons): 14.1% of the English-speaking respondents, as compared with only 2.7% of the French-speaking respondents, indicated that they could think of nothing that needs improving. French-speaking respondents were also somewhat more anxious than English-speaking respondents to see procedural changes implemented and to suggest that the personnel of Parliament needs improving. English-speaking M.P.s expressed more interest in having set sessions of the House of Commons established, and were a little more inclined to say that





they objected to the time that is wasted in having all the party leaders of the House making speeches on formal occasions; they were also somewhat more inclined to say that the work of the House is impeded by the fact that there are "too many parties". M.P.s from both language groups had "other" suggestions of pressing problems: several mentioned (one again) that there is "too much politicking"; two specifically mentioned that Dominion-Provincial conferences are weakening the position of the House of Commons; one M.P. mentioned the weakness of the Speaker, another the desirability of having a permanent Speaker; a few others raised the problem of the ability of the House of Commons to control delegated legislation and the need to use more experts in their proceedings in committee.

Table 6.15

Pressing Problems (And by Implication Reforms) Mentioned by English and French-Speaking Respondents Who Were At All Critical of the Effectiveness of the House of Commons\*

	<u>% of English-speaking M.P.s mentioning problem</u>	<u>% of French-speaking M.P.s mentioning problem</u>	<u>TOTAL N</u>
there are no pressing problems	14.1	2.7	13
procedural changes are needed	61.9	84.4	79
set sessions should be established	15.5	3.1	14
there are too many parties	19.0	12.5	20
more effective use should be made of committees	23.8	15.6	25
too much time wasted through having all party leaders speak on formal occasions	8.3	3.1	8
the personnel of the House of Commons needs improving	6.0	18.8	11
other problems	14.3	15.6	17

\* totals more than 100% because respondents often mentioned more than one "pressing problem"



We also noted that the other major factors distinguishing respondents' judgements of the effectiveness of the House of Commons was their minor party status. English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives were found to be roughly equally agreed on the effectiveness of the House of Commons. When we looked at what M.P.s consider to be the "pressing problems" of the House of Commons, we found that to some extent the difference between the minor and major parties holds up, but we also discovered fundamental differences in the responses of Conservatives and Liberals.

Conservatives (18.9%) and Liberals (9.4%) are alone in saying that they think there are no pressing problems which prevent the House of Commons from doing what they think it ought to be doing; this fact distinguishes the major parties from the minor parties. But beyond this there are no striking differences between the "third parties" and the "old-line parties" as such. New Democrats are unanimous in saying that procedural reforms are necessary, and Social Crediters are more inclined than others to say that committees need to be used more effectively; but when one surveys the responses the clearly significant differences are between the Conservative Party and all the others, Conservatives are considerably more inclined than others to say that there are no pressing problems, and among those who mentioned pressing problems it is quite clear that procedural reforms loom less important than for any other party. On the other hand, Conservatives were far more inclined than any other party to say that there are too many parties. Because, in our analysis of parties, respondents who said that they objected to the speeches of all the party leaders on formal occasions were included in the general category "other", we are not able to say with certainty what percentage of Conservatives mentioned this related factor as a pressing problem; but it is certainly our recollection from the



interview protocols that this answer was prominent among Conservatives. Liberals, particularly English-speaking Liberals, were considerably more inclined than Conservatives to suggest that more efficient use must be made of the committees.<sup>14</sup>

Considering the fact that Conservatives were most inclined to say that the parliamentary system does not assume a minor role for backbenchers in the framing of legislation, and considering that the Conservatives form the major opposition party, it is perhaps not at all surprising that they should have been less anxious for procedural changes and for the more efficient use of committees. Now that procedural reforms have been implemented to some extent, it would be interesting to know whether French-speaking M.P.s are still as disposed to say that the House of Commons is not effective, given that their major complaint seems to have been the problem of procedural reform.<sup>15</sup>

Analysis in terms of the urban/rural location of constituencies revealed no significant variations. Regional patterns follow generally those expected on the basis of language and party variations. It is worth remarking, however, that Maritime M.P.s (true of both parties) were most inclined to say that procedural reforms are necessary, and M.P.s from the Prairies and British Columbia were, not surprisingly, most inclined to say that they thought that set sessions of Parliament would be desirable.

It may be recalled that in the "other responses" to the question of

---

<sup>14</sup>See Table 6.16 for an analysis of responses by party.

<sup>15</sup>76% of the French-speaking Liberals mentioned procedural changes as necessary reforms; 69.2% of the English-speaking Liberals mentioned the same factor. English-speaking Liberals were more inclined than French-speaking Liberals to mention the need to make more effective use of committees.





Table 6.16

Pressing Problems of House of Commons, by Party

	(horizontal %) (Independents omitted)					
	there are no pressing problems	procedural changes are needed	set sessions should be established	there are too many parties	more effective use would be made of committees	the personnel of the House of Commons needs improving
Liberals	9.4	71.9	7.8	10.9	25.0	6.3
Conservatives	18.9	43.2	8.1	32.4	10.8	2.7
New Democrat	0.0	100.0	44.4	11.1	22.2	11.1
Social Credit	0.0	60.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
Creditiste	0.0	66.6	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0
N =	13	79	14	20	25	6



whether "pressing problems" prevented the House of Commons from doing what it ought to be doing, only two respondents mentioned that in their opinion Dominion-Provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament's work. Because this criticism has often been made by others we decided to try to discover the feelings of all respondents on the issue by asking them to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the simple statement: "Dominion-Provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament".

One-third of the respondents agree with the statement; 63% disagree with the statement; and 4.6% are not sure. There are no differences between the two principal language groups on the subject; nor are there any significant differences according to the urban/rural location of constituencies. However, there are differences between the parties. Liberals are just a little more inclined to disagree with the statement than Conservatives, but the differences between the two major parties are really insignificant. The major difference is that New Democrats and Social Credit M.P.s are considerably more inclined to agree that the Dominion-Provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament. In regional terms the differences are generally slight also. The only point worth mentioning is that M.P.s from British Columbia are most inclined (45.5%) to agree with the statement, but this fact is to some extent accounted for by the position of New Democrats. Also noteworthy is the fact that there is a slight relationship between the feeling that the House of Commons is not very effective and agreement with the statement: 43.9% of those who think that the House of Commons is not very effective, as compared with only 25.8% of those who think it is effective, agree with the statement that Dominion-Provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament.



Table 6.17

Responses of M.P.s to: "Dominion-Provincial Conferences  
Detract from the Importance of Parliament", by Party  
(horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with the statement</u>	<u>disagree with the statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	25.4	71.2	3.4
Conservatives	32.1	64.3	3.6
New Democrats	55.6	33.3	11.1
Social Credit	60.0	20.0	20.0
Créditiste	33.3	66.7	0.0
N =	35	68	5

In the next section, when we discuss the M.P.'s performance of his parliamentary role, we will consider further problems and further reforms that have been mentioned by respondents; but before leaving the general subject of Parliament, it is worthwhile examining the responses of M.P.s to a number of further questions designed to elicit their reaction to certain suggestions for structural changes that have from time to time been made.

The following suggestion was made in the course of a preliminary interview with an M.P. (during the early summer of 1964) and repeated, in more or less identical terms, by another later. It therefore seemed reasonable to see how much agreement or disagreement there may be among M.P.s to the suggestion that: "The Commons would be a more efficient





institution if it were cut to, say, 150 members, each with paid assistants."

Examination of the responses reveals a considerable difference of opinion based on the respondent's principal language group: French-speaking M.P.s are much more inclined to agree with the suggestion than English-speaking M.P.s. Nor can this difference of opinion based on language differences be explained in terms of the agreement of any one group of French-speaking M.P.s. Among English-speaking M.P.s, New Democrats, and Social Crediters are more inclined to disagree with the suggestion than Liberals and Conservatives. Among English-speaking M.P.s Conservatives are the most inclined to agree with the proposition.

Table 6.18

Responses of Backbench M.P.s to: "The

House of Commons Would Be a More Efficient Institution

If It Were Cut To, Say, 150 Members, Each With Paid Assistant".

a) By Principal Language Group (horizontal %)

	<u>agree with idea</u>	<u>disagree with idea</u>	<u>not sure</u>
English	28.4	68.9	2.7
French	47.1	35.3	17.6
N =	37	63	8

b) By Party (horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with idea</u>	<u>disagree with idea</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	32.8	58.6	8.6
Conservatives	34.5	62.1	3.4
New Democrats	22.2	77.8	0.0
Social Credit	40.0	60.0	0.0
Créditiste	50.0	16.7	33.3



There were no significant variations when the results were analysed in terms of the urban/rural location of constituencies; but there were regional variations worth noting. Ontario M.P.s (77.1%) were the most inclined to disagree with the suggestion; Maritime M.P.s (66.7%) were just a little less inclined to disagree than Ontario Members. There were, however, no differences between M.P.s from the three other regions in terms of their disposition to agree with the statement. Quebec M.P.s (largely because of the Cr ditistes) were most inclined to say that they were not sure.<sup>16</sup>

On the face of it there is no obvious reason why French-speaking M.P.s should be considerably more in favour of the suggested reform than English-speaking M.P.s. In a sense there are really two propositions to which the M.P. might react contained within the same statement: there is the question of making the House of Commons more efficient by reducing its numbers, and there is the suggestion that the efficiency of the House would be aided through the existence of paid assistants for those who remain. One possible explanation of the reason why French-speaking M.P.s tended to be more favourable to the idea (let it not be forgotten that less than a

---

16

When we examined the responses in terms of purposive roles and inclination to say that the House of Commons is an effective institution, we found that Lawmakers were most inclined to agree with the suggested reform; we also discovered that those who were critical of the effectiveness of the House of Commons were most inclined to agree with the reform. However, the fact that French-speaking M.P.s were significantly prominent among both the Lawmakers and those who were critical of the effectiveness of the House of Commons, it is quite possible that we have merely discovered substantiating evidence for the basic dichotomy in terms of principal language group that we have already noted.



majority of the French-speaking M.P.s agreed with it) is that they saw immediate benefits to their own performance of the job of being an M.P. from the possibility of employing a paid assistant back in the constituency looking after the routine requests of their constituents. (There is no evidence, as will be seen later, that the French-speaking M.P. is especially anxious to employ the assistants in research).<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, it must be noted that Maritime M.P.s, who are equally confronted with constituency matters, were notably less inclined to say that they approved of the idea. If we are correct in thinking that it was essentially the notion of having a paid assistant (who could relieve the M.P. of a good deal of work within the constituency, or relating to the constituency) which appealed to some French-speaking M.P.s, then we might be able to explain the difference between their opinions on the statement and those of the Maritime M.P.s by recourse to their different role perceptions. French-speaking M.P.s, as we have already noted, confirm that in practice they spend a lot of time looking after their constituencies, but several suggested that they felt that their roles ought to involve them more in the process of legislation. Maritime M.P.s, on the other hand, appear to be satisfied with the role of Liaison Officer with their constituencies and may not feel any particular need to have paid assistants relieve them of this responsibility.

We also invited respondents to react to the following statement, which is by no means novel and has direct implications for the character of the House of Commons and the parties:

---

17

See below.





The notion of alternating the leadership of political parties from English Canadians to French Canadians is a good one and ought to be followed generally.

We could certainly expect a divergence of opinion on this question between M.P.s from the two principal language groups, and also between M.P.s of different parties, and we were not disappointed. French-speaking M.P.s and English-speaking M.P.s, overall, were sharply divided on the notion: 79.4% of the French-speaking M.P.s agreed with the idea as compared with only 30.7% of the English-speaking M.P.s. The differences between the parties were also sharp: among English-speaking M.P.s it was only within the Liberal Party that a majority (a bare majority of 51.4%) agreed with the suggestion; among the other English-speaking M.P.s there was almost complete disagreement: 81.5% of the English-speaking Conservatives disagreed with the idea of alternating leadership; 77.8% of the New Democrats disagreed; and both English-speaking Social Credit M.P.s disagreed with the idea. Among French-speaking M.P.s it was the Liberals, 86.4% of whom agreed with the suggestion, who were most in favour of alternating the leadership of political parties between English and French Canadians. In regional terms the differences can generally be explained in terms of the language and party differences already noted: the one important point to observe, however, is that not one M.P. from British Columbia agreed with the idea. Clearly, the most significant fact is that within the Liberal Party, where the question of alternating leadership between the two principal language groups is most relevant, a majority of M.P.s agree with the proposition.

Finally, among the suggested structural reforms of Parliament, we may examine reactions to a rather extreme idea for Senate reform. We asked



all respondents to express their agreement or disagreement with the following proposition:

A Senate conceived of as a "Chamber of Nationalities", representing English and French in equal proportions, would be a useful reform to our parliamentary system.

By stating that the composition of the Chamber would be made up of English and French in equal proportions we probably tipped the scales in favour of English-speaking respondents' disagreeing with the idea, and this was in fact the result: only one English-speaking M.P. said he agreed with the notion; 93.3% said they disagreed; and 5.3% said they were not sure. From our point of view, then, it was more interesting to discover how many French-speaking M.P.s would agree with this extreme formulation of a possible second chamber reform.

Not quite half the French-speaking M.P.s agreed with the idea: 48.5% said they agreed; 42.4% said they disagreed and 9.1% said they were not sure. It is important to know which French-speaking M.P.s were most inclined to agree with the reform idea. Actually there is not much difference between the French-speaking M.P.s of the different parties: 50% of the Liberals agreed with the radical proposition; the two Conservatives we interviewed were divided on the matter; one Social Credit favoured the idea, two were opposed; two Cr ditistes were in favour, one was opposed and two were not sure. Undoubtedly the most surprising fact to emerge from our consideration of the responses to this statement is the observation that half the French-speaking Liberals are in favour of the idea, whereas not one single English-speaking Liberal agrees.

Some light can be thrown on the attitude of French-speaking M.P.s



towards the reform proposal under question by examining their reactions (earlier in the interview) to the Senate as it now exists. Only 15.6% of the French-speaking M.P.s, as compared with 51.9% of the English-speaking respondents, stated that the Senate in its present form is effective in fulfilling its role; 31.3% of the French-speaking respondents, as compared to only 14.3% of the English-speaking respondents (nearly all New Democrats), favoured abolishing the Senate. And what role do French-speaking respondents think the Senate should perform? Twenty-seven per cent think that the Senate performs no role at all, but among those who do think that it performs a role, several mentioned more than one function: 45.5% said that it may act as a check upon government or a "sober second thought" on legislation; 21.2% said that it is a place where useful committee work may be done in specialized areas; 12.1% said that it might be used to replace some of the work of Royal Commissions; 18.2% said that it is a place where more legislation might be considered; and 21.2% mentioned other uses to which the Senate might be put. What is so significant about the answers of French-speaking respondents is the fact that only two French-speaking M.P.s mentioned the rôle of the Senate as a locus of regional representation.

### III. Parliamentary Aspects of the M.P.'s Role: General Considerations

We have already examined in some detail the general orientation of our respondents to the political process. We then explored their general attitudes to the House of Commons (and briefly the Senate) and considered their reactions to a number of suggested reforms of the parliamentary structure. We now focus particularly on the parliamentary aspects of the M.P.'s role, with the general purpose of discovering (and comparing) the manner in which our respondents go about performing their tasks as they see





them. In the course of this analysis we will consider the different interests which M.P.s have, the problems which they encounter in performing their parliamentary tasks, their general attitudes towards the role which M.P.s can play in the legislative process, and their views on the role of party caucus. Finally we will consider respondents' views on the "qualities of a good M.P." and attempt to discover whether respondents perceive differences among Members in terms of either the party or the province from which the M.P. happens to come. Throughout, differences based on the respondents' principal language group will be the major focus of attention.

(1) Political Interests

Early in the interview we asked all respondents a number of questions designed to permit us to ascertain their general perceptions of the M.P.'s role. Later in the interview we confronted them with a much more specific question on their "main political interests". Certain coding problems were presented in handling the responses. We were not concerned with the specific nature of the M.P.'s interest (i.e., whether he happened to be concerned mainly with transport as compared with agriculture), but whether his interests were almost exclusively related to his constituency, national causes or problems (such as abolition of capital punishment, constitutional problems and co-operative federalism); regional causes; or committee work other than that immediately related to his constituency (e.g. Defence, External Affairs, Food and Drug Committee). Inevitably there was a certain arbitrariness in deciding, especially, that an M.P.'s interests were mainly concerned with his constituency; but we were guided by our knowledge of the character of the respondent's constituency and its problems. Some M.P.s



mentioned having more than one main interest, and we allowed for as many as three interests in our coding of responses.

Overall "national causes" represent the main interests of 54.2% of our respondents; 39.8% mentioned a main interest in constituency problems; 16.9% mentioned a main interest in committee matters; 11.9% mentioned a main interest in regional causes; 12.7% mentioned other main interests; and 6.7% of the respondents admitted that they have no special interests at all. Some of the responses, classed as "other" in the table below are interesting: three mentioned a specific interest in parliamentary procedure; two said that their main interest was to keep returning to the House of Commons so long as they wished to; two said they were especially interested in international relations; two said their main political interest was to advance personally; and one M.P. said that his main political interest is to try to get power for his party.

When the responses are examined according to the different role perceptions, we find a close relationship between perception and major political interest. No particular representational role type was especially disposed to say that he had no special interests, but Constituency Delegates were most disposed to say that constituency problems were their main interests: 57.1% of the Constituency Delegates, as compared to only 25.6% of the Trustees mentioned this type of major interest. Mixed Types (whom we saw earlier often displayed a considerable concern for their constituencies) were only a little less disposed than Constituency Delegates to mention constituency interests. On the other hand Trustees (71.8%) were most disposed to say that they were interested in national causes, as compared to Constituency Delegates, only 28.8% of whom mentioned a main interest in



similar matters. No single representational role type appeared to be especially concerned with committee work, although Mixed Types (among whom French Canadians loom rather large) were the least concerned with committee work.

The same general correspondence between role perception and interest is revealed when we compare the responses in terms of areal roles. Constituency Dominant respondents were the most inclined to mention constituency interests: 52.5% of the Constituency Dominant M.P.s mentioned such interests as compared with only 25.9% of the National Dominant respondents and 28.6% of the Shared Focus respondents. Constituency Dominant M.P.s were less inclined to mention a main interest in committee work which was not necessarily related to their constituencies' particular problems. National causes were mentioned by 64.5% of the Nation Dominant respondents, whereas only 44.3% of the Constituency Dominant M.P.s mentioned national causes. No areal role type was particularly prominent, however, in mentioning regional causes.

We have already pointed to the fact that there were relatively few differences between the respondents in terms of their purposive role perceptions; it is perhaps not surprising then that there are hardly any clear differences in interest revealed when we analyse the main political interests of respondents in terms of this variable. The only point worth noting is that Ombudsmen appear to be a little more interested in committee work than any of the other purposive role types. When we compare the responses in terms of the method by which respondents were recruited we find differences at least as far as interest in constituency and national causes are concerned: conscripted M.P.s are considerably more inclined





than others to say that they have a main political interest in constituency matters, whereas self-recruited M.P.s are most inclined to say that they have an interest in national causes. Interestingly, co-opted M.P.s appear to be less concerned with constituency matters as major political interests than conscripted M.P.s, but they are as interested as conscripted respondents in national causes. When we compared respondents in terms of their experience in the House of Commons, few differences emerged. Those with less than three years experience appear to be slightly more interested in national causes and a little less interested in constituency matters, but the differences between the two groups, it must be emphasized, are slight indeed.

Finally, we come to the major variables employed throughout this analysis: mother tongue; party; region; and the urban/rural location of the respondent's constituency. It can be said at once that the last factor appears to be insignificant in distinguishing the responses. The respondent's principal language group is significant in several important senses. English-speaking respondents are no more inclined than French-speaking respondents to point to main political interests in the constituency, region or "other" areas. But we found that French-speaking M.P.s are much more inclined to say that they have no special political interests at all; that they are almost completely unconcerned with committee matters as their main political interest<sup>18</sup>; and that they are somewhat less inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to mention a main interest in national causes.

---

<sup>18</sup> See Chapter One.



Table 6.19

Main Political Interests of English and French-

Speaking M.P.s (horizontal %)\*

	<u>no main political interest</u>	<u>constituency matters</u>	<u>committee work</u>	<u>national causes</u>	<u>regional causes</u>	<u>other</u>
English	2.4	40.2	23.2	59.8	11.0	12.2
French	16.7	38.9	2.8	41.7	13.9	13.9
N =	8	47	20	64	14	15

\* totals more than 100% because some respondents mentioned more than one main political interest.

When differences in responses between the parties are examined, it is clear that there are no major differences between the two major parties (especially if one looks only at the English-speaking Members). But when one looks at differences within the Liberal Party (as between the two principal language groups) the differences between the two groups are actually a little more sharply revealed than they are when we simply compared English and French responses overall.

Table 6.20

English and French-Speaking Liberals' Main Political

Interests ("others" omitted) (horizontal %)

	<u>no main political interest</u>	<u>constituency matters</u>	<u>committee work</u>	<u>national causes</u>	<u>regional causes</u>
English	0.0	43.2	27.0	62.2	13.5
French	13.0	52.2	4.3	39.1	17.4



When the two major parties are compared with the others some further interesting differences emerge: Social Credit M.P.s and New Democrats are much more inclined to say that their main political interest is in national causes and are correspondingly less inclined to mention constituency interests. No English-speaking M.P.s appear to have the monopoly of interest in committee work. Cr ditistes are relatively the most inclined of any to say that they have no main political interests.

Regional differences in this case appear to be explained in terms of the language and party differences already noted. There are not, in short, many particularly significant differences within the predominantly English-speaking regions of the country. The only points worth noting are that M.P.s from the Maritimes and British Columbia appear to be a little more disposed to say that their main interests are regional causes, while M.P.s from the Prairies are a little more inclined to say that their interests centre on committee work.

Having established the respondent's main political interest(s), we went on to ask: "What are the most useful and important things you can do to further these interests?" Since the major distinguishing factor as far as main political interests are concerned is the principal language group of the respondent, the analysis of the methods of pursuing these interests focuses on the bilingual/bicultural variables. Once more, respondents frequently mentioned more than one device for furthering their interests.

Overall the most important single tactic favoured by M.P.s for furthering their interests is the making of public speeches and the attempt to mobilize public opinion through writing for the press, and appearing on radio and television. Nearly forty per cent of the





respondents mentioned this technique. Talking to the minister concerned with a particular policy, doing research on one's particular area of interest, and attending the committee dealing with one's interest were each also mentioned by about 25% of the respondents. Twenty per cent mentioned that they would attempt to further their interest by talking about it in caucus; 11.8% said that they would simply speak about their interest in Parliament; and 6.9% said that they would try to speak to the "policy influentials", who varied with circumstances. In addition to these major tactics for furthering political interests there was a wide variety of other methods mentioned, depending on the different interests which the Member happened to have. Five mentioned working in ad hoc party policy committees; four mentioned making good contacts with the Civil Service; three mentioned belonging to trade associations; two mentioned getting to know their constituents better; one mentioned waiting for the appropriate moment to try to get rid of an obstructive minister; another mentioned that he would attempt to participate in trade missions; and another mentioned learning the House of Commons rules well so as to be more effective.

Just as there are differences between the two principal language groups in their disposition to mention a main political interest and in the main political interests which were mentioned, so there are differences in the methods used for furthering their interests. Both groups are about equally inclined to talk in caucus and to attempt to create a favourable public opinion by a wide variety of propagandistic techniques; but beyond this differences in approach are clear. French-speaking M.P.s are far less inclined to mention conducting research on



their particular area of interest; they are also less inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to say that they would attend committees. French-speaking M.P.s, on the other hand, are somewhat more inclined to say that they would try to talk to the minister concerned.

Table 6.21

Major Methods Used by English and French-Speaking M.P.s  
to Further Their Main Political Interests (horizontal %)\*

	would speak in caucus	would talk to Minister concerned	would try to mobilize public opinion	would do research on major interest	would attend committee deal- ing with in- terest
English	20.7	23.4	40.3	31.2	29.9
French	20.0	32.0	36.0	4.0	16.0
N =	21	26	40	25	27

\* totals more than 100% because several Members mentioned more than one method.

One of the differences in the method of furthering one's political interests, the tactic of talking with a Minister, deserves further attention. Generally speaking this approach is used basically by Members of the Liberal Party, although a few Conservatives said they also might approach the Minister concerned with their interests. It is also a little more frequently used by French-speaking Liberals than English-speaking Liberals. But which Ministers do they tend to approach? We did not ask this particular question in the context of the general question of the techniques used in furthering one's political interest; but earlier in the



interview we did ask all respondents: "Are there any particular ministers in the government to whom you naturally turn for information, advice and assistance?" The answers to this question are relevant here, and tend to confirm the notion that French-speaking M.P.s prefer to deal with "leurs ministres". Seventy-six per cent of the English-speaking respondents who answered the question (there were a number of English-speaking respondents who said that they never approached a Minister) stated that it was not a question of dealing with any particular minister, but rather of dealing with the minister who happened to be in charge of the problem which concerned the respondent; only 42.4% of the French-speaking respondents gave this type of answer. Eighteen per cent of the French-speaking M.P.s, as compared with 15% of the English-speaking M.P.s, said that they deal only with ministers from their province. The difference between the two principal language groups is accounted for by nearly 40% of the French-speaking respondents (as compared with only 6.3% of the English-speaking respondents) who said that they approach ministers from their own province and others. The replies to this question are less sharply defined than we might like, but the overall impression is that French-speaking M.P.s are somewhat more disposed to turn to their own ministers rather than the English-speaking minister who may actually be in charge of the department dealing with their particular problem.

## (2) Problems of the Job

At roughly the midway point in our interviews with respondents we asked them to tell us what they find are the most pressing problems they encounter in trying to do their job. We wanted to know what factors, if any, hinder their task. Handling the wide variety of answers we received





proved a difficult problem indeed, for although there were clearly a number of common problems which many respondents shared, the answers to this question, like those to the question requesting suggested reforms to meet their problems, revealed an almost bewildering variety of personal difficulties. Had we forced respondents to try to focus on the one single problem they found the most difficult to handle, we would have made our analysis much simpler, but then we would have sacrificed a great deal in the process. Because so many respondents mentioned more than one problem we coded up to four "problems of the job" for each respondent; and because within the four responses many included answers that were largely personal (not shared by many others) the number of "other problems" is particularly large. But it must be appreciated that there were also a number of common problems which many M.P.s mentioned, and that the "other" difficulties mentioned often represented the third and/or fourth problems mentioned by respondents.

The most important single problem mentioned by respondents (35.6% of the total) as hindering their task as M.P.s is the time taken in constituency work. The next most pressing problem as far as the entire group is concerned is the lack of research facilities: 28.8% of the respondents mentioned this particular problem. Twenty-two per cent mentioned the problem of the time taken in having to appear in Parliament for debates and divisions, 18.6% mentioned the time taken in committee work; and 17.8% mentioned the difficulties they encounter with government "red tape". Ten M.P.s (8.5% of our respondents), however, stated that they experience no pressing problems in trying to their jobs as M.P.s.

We cannot mention here all the "other difficulties" mentioned by



respondents: the following is meant therefore only as a sampling of the many problems referred to. One set of problems relate specifically to the Civil Service: from a few M.P.s came the complaint that the Civil Service is replacing the M.P. as a legislator; others complained of the way in which civil servants frustrate decisions agreeable to the M.P.'s constituents; seven French-speaking M.P.s complained of language difficulties when dealing with the Civil Service. Another set of problems centered around the facilities provided to backbenchers; some thought the telephone allowance was too small; another thought the Member's expense account was too small; and still others complained about the lack of a reference library.

Generally speaking there are few differences between the two principal language groups. The most striking difference, however, is the fact that not a single French-speaking M.P. mentioned the time taken up in committee work. This is not surprising since, as we have already seen, French-speaking M.P.s are less inclined to think of the committee as a place in which to pursue their political interests, and spend relatively less time in committee work than their English-speaking counterparts. French-speaking respondents were also less inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to mention the time taken up in constituency work and in parliamentary appearances, although the differences between the two groups were not great. Both groups were about equally disposed to mention problems of "red tape", lack of research facilities and the time spent in travelling to and from constituencies.

One difference between the two groups which has been suggested above in our discussion of "other" problems requires further attention: the problem which the French-speaking M.P. experiences when dealing with English-



speaking civil servants. No specific question was placed on the questionnaire dealing with this matter, but interviewers were asked to probe for any difficulties that arise with the civil service, especially over the question of language facility. As we have noted seven (roughly 20%) of the French-speaking respondents mentioned the problem; but we have reason to think that for some reason the French-speaking interviewers may have been lax in probing respondents on the question of their relationship with the civil service. In any case there were a great many French-language interview protocols which contained no references at all to relations with civil servants, whereas most English-language protocols did. Because the number of "no answers" among French-speaking respondents is so high, it is difficult to be certain of our results, but it may be significant to note that of those who did answer the probing questions (half the French-speaking respondents) only four said that their relationship with civil servants was always satisfactory; seven mentioned experiencing language difficulties with the Civil Service and four others made extremely critical remarks about the Civil Service which went beyond the complaint about its fundamental unilingualism. On the other hand no English-speaking M.P. mentioned experiencing language difficulties with civil servants (although four were also extremely critical of them in other ways) and nearly 55% said that their relationship with civil servants was always entirely satisfactory.

When the responses are compared by party only a few noteworthy differences appear: Conservatives (especially those in the older age groups from the Prairies) are most inclined to say that there is nothing hindering their performance of their jobs; New Democrats are the only English-speaking M.P.s not to complain about the time taken in committee work; and Conservatives are most inclined to complain about the inadequacy of research





facilities.<sup>19</sup> In regional terms the only point worth noting (that is not simply explained in terms of language or party differences) is the fact that M.P.s from British Columbia are most disposed to complain about the inadequacy of research facilities. Finally, examination of the problems of the job according to the representational role perceptions of respondents revealed a few interesting variations: Constituency Delegates and Mixed Types were considerably more inclined to mention the problem of the time taken in committee work as one of the factors hindering their task as an M.P.; they were also considerably more inclined than Party Delegates and Trustees to mention the problem of the time taken up in constituency work. Time wasted in travelling appeared to be more important for Mixed Types than any other M.P.s, while the lack of research facilities appears to bother them less than the others.

As soon as respondents had developed their answers to the problems of the job as they saw them, we asked them: "What reforms would you make if you could?" As we have already intimated there was a tremendous variety of answers to this question, reflecting a wide range of personal attitudes towards the difficulties of doing one's job as an M.P. Moreover, the number of "no answers" to this question was very high. Presumably many M.P.s were unable or unwilling to offer many solutions to their difficulties. Twenty-two per cent of the respondents who answered the question thought that no reforms were necessary; since this is a considerably larger percentage of M.P.s than those who said there were no problems at all, we may surmise that many who recognized problems felt that they were inevitably part of the facts of parliamentary life and were not susceptible to change.

---

<sup>19</sup> But see footnote 20 below.



Presumably many who complained about the time taken in constituency work and parliamentary appearances might well have fallen into this category. The most important single reform mentioned by respondents was the suggestion to provide members with a personal research staff: nearly fifty per cent of the respondents who mentioned any reform at all pointed to this possible method of improving the M.P.'s lot. Only three other reforms received mention with any degree of regularity: 14.3% of the respondents suggested providing more secretarial help; 8.3% suggested providing M.P.s with a personal staff in the constituencies; and 8.3% of the respondents mentioned making the civil service and/or all aspects of parliamentary life completely bilingual. In addition to these major reforms were a whole host of other suggestions: three respondents wanted to see the creation of an ombudsman to protect both electors and elected; three mentioned the desirability of a research library; two wanted to see the estimates procedure modernized; two (both French-speaking) wanted to see the electorate educated to appreciate the legislative aspects of the M.P.'s role; several others wanted a number of Civil Service reforms to be carried out, ranging from requiring the civil servants to consult with M.P.s before taking action, to cutting down the size of the Civil Service staff.

Because of the large number of "no answers" and the large number of "other" reforms suggested by respondents, it is difficult to make too much of the responses to this question. But when we compared the responses of the two principal language groups, a few interesting differences emerge. English-speaking M.P.s were more inclined to say that no reforms were necessary: 25.0% of the English-speaking respondents compared to only 14.3% of the French-speaking respondents gave this answer. But among those who singled out reforms, there are clear differences between the two



language groups. English-speaking M.P.s were most inclined to mention the value of providing a research staff for backbench M.P.s: 60.3% of the English-speaking M.P.s who answered our question, as compared with only 21.4% of the French-speaking M.P.s mentioned this idea. But this difference in responses is actually misleading. When all respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with the specific statement "The House of Commons should equip itself with a more extensive professional staff in order to have its own sources of technical information", French-speaking M.P.s were actually slightly more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to agree.<sup>20</sup> We may conclude from this that French-speaking M.P.s are not less interested in better research facilities than English-speaking M.P.s but that, given the range of problems which confront M.P.s performing their tasks, there are other reforms which are relatively more important to French-speaking M.P.s. That this is so is shown by the fact that 29% of the French-speaking M.P.s (as compared to no English-speaking M.P.s) mentioned the desirability of reforming the civil service to make it truly bilingual. Two French-speaking respondents went further than this and also suggested that every aspect of parliamentary life should be completely bilingual. English-speaking and French-speaking respondents were roughly equally disposed to mention the need to provide M.P.s with more secretarial help and a personal staff in the constituency. When we put together the

---

20

Eighty per cent of all respondents agreed with the suggestion: 85.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s agreed and 77.0% of the English-speaking M.P.s agreed. Conservatives, especially those from Ontario were less inclined to agree than M.P.s from any other party. Keeping in mind that earlier we noticed that Conservatives were the most inclined (in an open-ended question) to mention the inadequacy of research facilities, it must be appreciated that, as in every party, there is plenty of scope for internal differences of opinion.





responses of the two language groups to the question of the degree of satisfaction with the M.P.'s relationship with the Civil Service, with the reforms that are suggested to deal with the problems M.P.s experience, it is clear that the unique problem is that which French-speaking M.P.s encounter in dealing with a largely English-speaking Civil Service. It may be that it is this difficulty which helps to account for the fact that French-speaking M.P.s are more disposed to turn to "leurs ministres" in pursuing their political interests.

(3) Attitudes Towards the Backbencher's Place in the Legislative Process

It has already been observed that three-quarters of our respondents agreed with the proposition that our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation. We also saw that most of the disagreement with this proposition came from Conservatives, Cr ditistes and Social Crediters; in other words, from M.P.s in the opposition parties. However, it is not necessary to presume that backbenchers exert no influence whatever on the decision-making process, and those who attempt to reconstruct a place for the backbencher within the legislative process normally point to the informal influences on legislation within the processes of party consultation, especially within party caucus.

We do not suggest that this aspect of the political process has been exhaustively examined in our multi-purpose study, but some questions which we asked about general attitudes to the place of the backbencher within the legislative process, and about the operations of the party caucuses, throw some fresh light on this important subject. For our purposes the degree of informal influence on party decision-making within the Liberal (government) Party is of greatest concern, the more so because it allows us to compare the attitudes of French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s within



the same party.

In order to confront the matter of the respondent's attitude toward his place in the legislative process, we asked all respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the following proposition:

Most of the time front bench policy is already decided before a backbencher has a chance to exert influence.

It is interesting that the numbers prepared to agree with this statement are fewer than those who say that our system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation. Overall, only 56.1% agreed, 35.1% disagreed and 8.8% were not sure. There is a close relationship between one's views on the two matters, as might be expected: 87% of those who feel that front bench policy is already decided agreed that our system assumes a minor role for backbenchers, whereas only 61.2% of those who disagreed with the suggestion that front bench policy is already decided agreed with the other proposition. There is also a relationship between the respondent's age and his position on the question of his influence on front bench policy: overall, the youngest Members of the House (nearly all Liberals in the under-34 age group) were the least inclined to agree with the statement, but they were also the most inclined to say they were not sure. M.P.s in the 35-44 age group were most inclined to agree with the statement, and this was especially true within the Liberal Party, where no fewer than 70% of the M.P.s in this age group agreed with the statement. House of Commons experience, and representational role perception, appear to have no effect on the respondent's attitude towards the question: M.P.s with less than three years' experience in the House were only fractionally more inclined to agree with the statement than those who had been around longer; Trustees and Party Delegates were a little more inclined to disagree with the



statement than Constituency Delegates and Mixed Types, but the differences are not really significant.

Nor are there any significant differences between the two principal language groups. It may be recalled that on the question of the role of the backbencher in framing legislation the difference between the two language groups had been slight, and what difference there was we found to be accounted for by the Cr  ditistes, who unanimously agreed with the notion that the backbencher is not assumed to play more than a minor role. When we examine the responses by party to some extent the results are the same. English and French-speaking Liberals hold almost precisely the same views on the question, both being more inclined than Conservatives, New Democrats and Cr  ditistes to agree with the proposition. In this case, however, Cr  ditistes are the least inclined to agree with the statement. Social Credit M.P.s, who were fully in agreement that the system assumes a minor role for backbenchers, are also the most inclined of any M.P.s to say that front bench policy is determined before M.P.s have a chance to influence it.

Table 6.22

Responses of Backbench M.P.s To: "Most of the Time Front Bench Policy is Already Decided Before a Backbencher Has A Chance to Exert Influence" (horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with the statement</u>	<u>disagree with the statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	55.2	36.2	8.6
Conservatives	41.4	58.6	0.0
New Democrats	44.4	55.6	0.0
Social Credit	80.0	20.0	0.0
Cr��ditiste	33.3	66.7	0.0
	54	49	5





When the results are examined regionally, the most significant point to emerge is the extent to which M.P.s from British Columbia disagree with the others: only 18.2% of the M.P.s from B.C. agreed with the statement; all the rest disagreed. M.P.s from the Prairies and Quebec were a little more inclined to agree with the statement than those from Ontario and the Maritimes.

Generally speaking, the important difference here is once again between government party and the rest (although the Social Credit Party for some unaccountable reason offers an exception). Within the Liberal Party, let it be emphasized again there is no difference in attitude between the English and French-speaking Members.

Although a majority of all the M.P.s (largely accounted for by the majority within the Liberal Party) agreed that most of the time backbenchers have little opportunity to influence front bench legislation, not many M.P.s (and this was as true of Liberals as others) were prepared to agree that the party caucus is useless as a place for exercising influence on party policy. One would expect that party caucus would be more influential in shaping party policy among the opposition parties, but it is interesting that Liberals are no less inclined than Opposition Members to disagree with the following statement:

People continually overrate the importance of the party caucus. It is a place to let off steam, perhaps, but it is not a place for influencing party policy.



Overall, only 13.1%<sup>21</sup> of the respondents agreed with this view; 85.0% agreed and 2.9% were not sure. No Cr ditiste agreed with the statement; Social Credit M.P.s were the most inclined to agree; but there was hardly any difference at all between Liberals, Conservatives and New Democrats.

Table 6.23

Responses of Backbench M.P.s to: "...Party Caucus...Is Not  
A Place for Influencing Party Policy" (horizontal %)  
(Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with the statement</u>	<u>disagree with the statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	13.6	86.4	0.0
Conservatives	10.7	85.7	3.6
New Democrats	11.1	88.9	0.0
Social Credit	40.0	60.0	0.0
Cr�ditiste	<u>0.0</u>	<u>80.0</u>	<u>20.0</u>
N =	14	91	2

The number of respondents who agree with the statement denying the effective policy influence of party caucus is so small that it is rather difficult to make much of our analysis of its composition, but it is worth noting that, within the Liberal Party, French-speaking respondents are just a little more inclined to agree with the statement than English-speaking

---

<sup>21</sup>This is exactly the same percentage of respondents as in Allan Kornberg's study (which included frontbenchers) of the 1962 Parliament "who viewed the caucus as a mechanism for facilitating a catharsis of legislators' grievances by providing a forum for their expression". An additional 3% said that caucus had no real function. Allan Kornberg, "Caucus and Cohesion in Canadian Parliamentary Parties", American Political Science Review, LX, March, 1966, p. 84.



M.P.s: only 10.8% of the English-speaking respondents, as compared with 18.2% of the French-speaking respondents agreed. The regional analysis, and the analysis in terms of urban/rural location of constituencies, reveal no pattern whatever. When the responses are examined from the point of view of the respondent's representational role type, we find that Mixed Types constitute 60% of all those who agree with the statement, but we must be careful not to read too much into this fact since French-speaking Liberals also tended to appear prominently within this group. All but one of the respondents who agree that party caucus is overrated also agreed that our parliamentary system assumes a minor role for backbenchers, whereas 72.5% of those who disagree with this evaluation of caucus agreed that our system assumes a minor role for backbenchers.

There is, clearly, a contradiction between the position of respondents (and particularly Liberal respondents) on the matter of the degree of their influence on party policy. On the one hand they agree (more than any other party except the Social Credit Party) that most of the time backbenchers have little opportunity to influence front bench legislation, but at the same time they appear to be saying that party caucus serves a more useful function than merely "letting off steam"; they imply that it actually is a place where party policy may be influenced. French-speaking M.P.s are a little less inclined to say this than English-speaking M.P.s, but the general impression is that the vast majority of both principal language groups within the Liberal Party agree with this position. Certainly, according to the older backbench Liberals, there has been a very great change in the character of the Liberal caucus since the days of Louis St. Laurent. At that time, continuing in the tradition of Mackenzie King,





party caucus appeared to exist for the sole purpose of the party leadership informing the backbench Members in general terms of the legislation the government proposed to introduce.<sup>22</sup> There was apparently little discussion of party policy by backbenchers and no influence on the content of legislation. And yet, if Liberal caucus has really become a forum for policy deliberation, why did so many agree that "most of the time front bench policy is already decided before a backbencher has a chance to exert influence"? Perhaps we can throw some light on this question by examining in a little further detail respondents' answers to a number of questions directed specifically at their party caucus(es).

(4) Party Caucuses: General, Provincial and Regional

Each of the five parties in the House of Commons hold regular general caucuses at least once a week during the parliamentary session. Attendance at party caucus, according to our respondents, is normally very good: a little more than two-thirds said that they always attend; a quarter said that they "usually" attend. Only four English respondents said that they "sometimes attend" and only one English respondent said that he "rarely attends". Apart from the fact that no French-speaking respondents fell within the latter two categories there were no differences between English and French-speaking respondents. There was actually a greater variation between the parties than between the two principal language groups. Cr ditistes were alone in saying unanimously that they always attend party caucus; New Democrats were the least inclined to say that they always attend; Conservatives were more inclined than others to say that they only sometimes

---

<sup>22</sup> See J.W. Pickersgill, The Mackenzie King Record, Toronto, 1960, p. 9.



(or rarely) attend party caucus. Next to the Cr ditistes, Liberals were the most inclined (71.4%) to say that they always attend party caucus.

In order to discover M.P.s' perceptions of the functions of the general party caucus we asked all respondents: "What do you see as the two main functions of your party caucus?" It is interesting to note that when Allan Kornberg tried to get at the same subject matter in his interviews with M.P.s in the 1962 Parliament using the question "What do you think are the two or three most important functions a caucus performs?", he found that "virtually all the respondents structured their responses in terms of 'caucus ought' rather than 'does'".<sup>23</sup> Having this in mind we were careful to check whether our slightly different form of questioning led to the same result; but it is our clear impression that respondents in our interviews framed their responses in terms of what functions they think caucus actually performs. As was indicated we asked all respondents to indicate the two most important functions of party caucus, and only 16 respondents failed to mention two responses to the question.

The most important single function as far as all respondents are concerned is that of communicating information either from backbench to frontbench or from frontbench to backbench: nearly 60% mentioned this function of caucus. That this function is not exactly the same as policy-making is indicated by the fact that only 40% mentioned this <sup>second</sup> function for the party caucus. 39% noted that party caucus serves the function of allowing

---

<sup>23</sup> Kornberg, Loc. cit. In his analysis, Kornberg, therefore, placed more reliance on the answers to another question which he asked: "In general, what do you discuss in caucus?" He notes, however, that "there were substantial similarities in their responses to this and the first question" (i.e., there were substantial similarities between the answers to what they discuss and what they think caucus ought to do).



Members to "let off steam" (Kornberg's "catharsis" function) and 33.6% referred to party caucus as a place in which party strategy is devised. Seven other respondents mentioned the specific function of "trying to reach a majority decision", three suggested that its function is to convey grass roots ideas to the party leadership and one other referred to it as an opportunity to activate political issues. There is, however, not much point in looking at the responses overall. Although there are hardly any differences between M.P.s in the two principal language groups generally, party differences are so important that we can only make sense of the responses when they are looked at in these terms.

Table 6.24

Major Functions of Party Caucus as Seen by English  
and French-Speaking M.P.s (horizontal %)

	<u>"let off steam"</u>	<u>communicate information</u>	<u>devise party strategy</u>	<u>devise party policy</u>	<u>other</u>
English	38.6	61.4	31.3	43.4	16.9
French	38.9	52.7	38.9	33.3	11.1
N =	46	70	40	48	18

The fundamental differences in perception of the function of party caucus are between the government party (the Liberals) and the others. For the Liberals the cathartic function of caucus ("letting off steam", in the words of most respondents) is clearly more important than for any other party. The most important function for the Liberals is the information-relaying function which caucus performs: 87.1% of the Liberals





mentioned this function, with English-speaking Liberals (94.7%) being somewhat more inclined to mention this function than French-speaking Liberals (75%). On the other hand opposition parties' M.P.s are far more inclined to see the function of party caucus as policy-making and strategy-devising. They are less disposed to mention the cathartic and information-communicating functions. Interestingly, however, the Progressive Conservative M.P.s are somewhat closer in their perceptions of the role of caucus than Members of the three other opposition parties. Conservatives are more inclined than other opposition M.P.s to mention the cathartic function of caucus, and less inclined to mention the strategy-devising function. What we are observing here is possibly the consequence of two differences between the Conservatives and the rest of the opposition. First there is the fact of the Conservative Party's having formed the government in the past: traditions of frontbench leadership in policy-making and strategy-devising undoubtedly carry over into opposition. Secondly there is the question of the size of the party's representation within the House: group formulation of party policy and strategy is undoubtedly easier within the smaller opposition parties than it is within the Conservative Party. Finally we may note that within the Liberal Party there are few differences between English and French-speaking M.P.s. We have already noted that English-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to mention the information-relaying function of caucus; but there are no differences between the two groups in the perceptions of party caucus as serving a cathartic and policy-making function. Interestingly, however, French-speaking M.P.s (25.0%) are more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s (only 12.9%) to mention the strategy-devising function of party caucus.



Table 6.25

Perceptions of the Major Functions of Party Caucus,  
by Party (horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>"let off steam"</u>	<u>communicate information</u>	<u>devise party strategy</u>	<u>devise party policy</u>
Liberal	56.5	87.1	12.9	21.0
Conservative	27.0	32.4	43.2	56.0
New Democrat	0.0	22.2	77.8	88.9
Social Credit	0.0	20.0	100.0	60.0
Créditiste	16.7	16.7	66.7	50.0

When the responses are examined in terms of urban/rural location of constituencies and region no significant differences emerge, but when we array the responses in terms of representational role perceptions some differences in the perceptions of the function of party caucus do appear. Constituency Delegates are most inclined to say that the function of party caucus is to "let off steam"; they are the least inclined to mention the policy-devising functions of party caucus. Party Delegates, on the other hand, are most disposed to say that the function of party caucus is to communicate information; they are also the least inclined to say that caucus devises party strategy. Trustees are most inclined to say that caucus devises party policy. Mixed Types appear to be undistinguished in terms of their perceptions of caucus functions.

Finally, when we compared perceptions of the function of caucus with agreement or disagreement with the statement that "most of the time front bench policy is already decided before a backbencher has a chance to exert influence" we find that those who mention the cathartic function



of caucus are most inclined to agree; those who point to the strategy-devising functions and "other" functions (e.g. "trying to reach majority decisions") are least inclined to agree. The differences are not great, and are less useful as an indicator of perception of the function of party caucus than the respondent's party, the factor that has emerged as clearly distinguishing the perceptions of our respondents.

It is quite apparent from the analysis presented thus far why members of the opposition parties are able to say that they disagree with the notion that party caucus is as a place to influence policy. Their perceptions of the function of party caucus clearly indicate that for them party caucus is a place in which party strategy and party policy is devised; the cathartic and information-communicating functions are evidently less important for opposition M.P.s. But we are still faced with the task of explaining why so many Liberals disagreed with the earlier proposition that "...party caucus is not a place for influencing policy".

For those Liberals who perceive the party caucus as a place in which party strategy and party policy are devised, obviously, the statement denigrating the role of party caucus will be rejected. But such M.P.s are too few in numbers to account for the entire group of Liberal respondents who disagreed with the statement. Seemingly the answer must be found in the attitudes of many of those who perceive of the function of party caucus as a medium for exchanging information. Given that the vast majority of Liberal M.P.s accept the fact that our parliamentary system assumes that the backbencher will play a minor role in framing legislation, the very fact that backbenchers nevertheless have an opportunity to convey their views to (or to be informed of the views of) the party's front bench is sufficient to persuade many of them that party caucus as an institution





is not overrated, and that to a limited extent they do have an influence on the policy decisions of the party. We have finally to deal, however, with the fact that whereas 56.5% of the Liberal respondents stated that one of the functions of party caucus is "to let off steam", only 13.6% of the Liberals agreed with the statement that party caucus is a place "to let off steam, perhaps, but it is not a place for influencing policy". Evidently, not all those who stated that one of caucus' functions is to act as a catharsis meant that party caucus therefore serves no useful purpose in influencing party policy. For some, clearly, this is the sole function of party caucus and must therefore be accounted insignificant as an instrument for influencing party policy; but for others, as Allan Kornberg put it, the party caucus, "in providing an opportunity for the venting of grievances and the release of built-up tensions... makes it easier for members to achieve a consensus on policy issues and to make united action on these issues,"<sup>24</sup> and in so far as this effect is achieved caucus is serving a useful function as far as the respondent is concerned.

General party caucuses are not the only institutionalized party groupings within the Canadian parliamentary system. Particularly within the Liberal Party there is also to be found the provincial and regional caucus. Maritime Liberals meet about once or twice a month in a regional caucus; Quebec Liberals meet weekly in a provincial (some call it regional) caucus; Ontario Liberals have a weekly province-wide caucus and, indeed, a caucus of Members from the Toronto area; and B.C. Liberals caucus weekly over supper. Mr. Diéfenbaker and several of his leading Conservative colleagues, we were told, disapprove of the notion of the regional

---

<sup>24</sup>Kornberg, op. cit., p. 85.



or provincial caucus, but Maritime Conservatives and Quebec Conservatives nevertheless continue to meet for all intents and purposes, as regional and provincial caucuses respectively. The Maritime Conservatives get together for a mainly social event three or four times a session; the Quebec caucus meets monthly to discuss more serious political matters. The minor parties, being small in numbers, do not possess regional or provincial caucuses.

We had hoped to find out something about the operations of these provincial and regional caucuses in our interviews, but except for the information obtained on the Quebec Liberal caucus, the responses are rather unsatisfactory. For one reason or another a considerable number of respondents refused to give us much information on this particular aspect of the operations of the Canadian party system. We therefore did not proceed with the analysis of this segment of the questionnaire. We did, however, receive a reasonable response to a general question seeking respondents' reactions to the existence of the provincial caucus as an institution. To the analysis of these results we now turn.

In Part B of the questionnaire we invited all respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the following statement:

The provincial caucus is an unwelcome and disruptive addition to the party system in the House of Commons.

Overall, the vast majority of respondents disagree with the suggestion: 20.2% agree; 67.3% disagree and 12.5% are not sure. Interestingly, there are no significant differences between the two principal language groups. The major differences this time are based on party, with the fundamental divergence being between the Liberal Party and all the others, except



that Conservatives (thanks particularly to the Maritime Conservatives) are somewhat more inclined to disagree with the statement than others. Cr ditistes are not so much in disagreement as uncertain on the matter.

Table 6.26

Responses of Backbench M.P.s to the Statement That the Provincial  
Caucus is an Unwelcome Addition to the House of Commons, by Party  
(horizontal %) (Independents omitted)

	<u>agree with statement</u>	<u>disagree with statement</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberal	5.2	86.2	8.6
Conservative	29.6	48.1	22.2
New Democrat	62.5	37.5	0.0
Social Credit	60.0	40.0	0.0
Cr�ditiste	40.0	20.0	40.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	21	20	13

The regional variation in the responses follows very closely the existence of provincial or regional caucuses within the parties and the differences already noted between the parties: Maritime, Ontario and Quebec M.P.s are least inclined to agree, while M.P.s from British Columbia and particularly the Prairies are most inclined to agree. The most interesting fact in regional terms is that not one Maritime M.P. agreed with the proposition.

#### (5) The Qualities of a "Good M.P."

Finally, as we mentioned earlier, we asked all respondents "What in your opinion are the main qualities of a good M.P.?" Because we anticipated the possibility of several responses, we coded as many as four "qualities" for each respondent.





As we expected, a great many respondents mentioned a variety of characteristics such as honesty, sincerity, integrity, patience and sensitivity, which we have considered together generally under the rubric "desirable personal characteristics": 72.2% of the respondents mentioned qualities of this kind. But a great many respondents also went on to mention rather more specific qualities of the "good M.P.", and because so many respondents shared an appreciation for the general personal characteristics, our interest inevitably centres on the other qualities deemed important by respondents. The next most prominent quality of a good M.P., in our respondents' opinion, is the "ability to work hard": 40.8% of the respondents mentioned this factor. Thereafter no one single quality appears to stand out. Nearly one-quarter of the respondents mentioned the quality of putting the interests of one's constituency or country ahead of one's personal interests; 22.6% mentioned the quality of devotion to and/or liking for the job of M.P.; 15.7% thought that the good M.P. should be a good speaker; 16.5% thought that expertise is important for a good M.P.; 11.3% thought that a pleasing personality (or the ability to project a good image) is important; and nearly 10% thought that a good M.P. should possess a real interest in people. There were, in addition, a number of other qualities mentioned, which have been drawn together under the classification "other" in the table below: four respondents thought that an M.P. should be well-educated; two mentioned that he should be a regular attender at debates; others mentioned the virtues of patriotism, keeping harmony at party caucus, being well-informed on the functions of Parliament, and being persuasive at the decision-making levels.

Interestingly, when the responses are arrayed in terms of many of the variables we have employed throughout the analysis, no significant



differences appear in the results. There are no significant variations when the responses are examined in terms of the urban/rural location of constituencies, region, party, age<sup>25</sup>, experience in the House of Commons, representational roles and purposive roles. The only significant variable is the mother tongue of the respondent; any differences between parties are a result of the language variable, and differences in terms of the language variable are not simply accounted for by any one group of M.P.s.

Most respondents, we noted, mentioned certain generally desirable personal qualities as features of the "good M.P.". It is worth pointing out, however, that French-speaking respondents were rather more inclined to mention these personal qualities than English-speaking M.P.s. French-speaking M.P.s were a little more inclined, on the other hand, to mention specifically the ability to work hard as a quality of the good M.P. The differences in perception of the qualities of a "good M.P." are clearer, however, when we compare some of the other qualities mentioned: English-speaking M.P.s were more inclined than French-speaking M.P.s to mention the value of a pleasing personality (good public image), speaking ability, devotion to the job, expertise, putting one's country and/or constituency ahead of one's personal interests, and being interested in people.

---

<sup>25</sup>

The only interesting fact about the age variable is that none of the respondents under 34 years of age mentioned "expertise" as a quality of a good M.P.



Table 6.27

Qualities of a "Good M.P." Mentioned by English  
and French-Speaking M.P.s\*

	<u>% of English- speaking M.P.s mentioning quality</u>	<u>% of French- speaking M.P.s mentioning quality</u>	<u>total N</u>
desirable personal qualities (honesty, sincerity, etc.)	63.3	91.7	83
good image	15.2	2.7	13
good speaker	19.0	8.3	18
devotion to/liking for job	26.6	13.9	26
expertise	20.3	8.3	19
putting interests of country and/or consti- tuency above personal interests	26.6	19.4	28
ability to work hard	38.0	47.2	47
liking for people	12.7	2.7	11
other	21.5	8.3	20

\*% totals more than 100% because nearly all respondents mentioned more than one quality.

Although we have observed that the only variable of any significance in distinguishing the responses of our respondents is the language variable, it must also be noted that the differences between the two principal language groups are not very great. Essentially both agree that a cluster of personal characteristics such as honesty, integrity, etc., are important qualities of a good M.P.; both also agree





on the importance of the M.P.'s ability to work hard. Where the two groups differ is, first, in the degree of which they mention these two major features, and, secondly, in the propensity for English-speaking M.P.s to rate an number of additional qualities of an M.P. as important, whereas French-speaking M.P.s are less disposed to recognize these same factors as important.

Given the fact that respondents are generally indistinguishable in their perceptions of the qualities of the "good M.P.", it is perhaps not surprising that M.P.s are generally agreed that these qualities would be mentioned by most M.P.s from other parties and other provinces.<sup>26</sup> Overall, 71.3% of the respondents said that there is no difference in the perceptions of the qualities of a good M.P. related to the M.P.'s province, and 67.2% said that there were no differences related to the M.P.'s party. Some respondents recognized differences in perception related to other factors (age, region, experience, etc.), but only 5.7% of the respondents were actually prepared to say that perceptions of the qualities of a good M.P. vary by party, and only 4.1% were prepared to say that these perceptions vary by province. Generally speaking, there were no significant differences between the respondents in their answers to these two questions, although it appeared that French-speaking respondents were just a little more inclined to say that there were no differences in perception.

---

<sup>26</sup> See questions 33b and 33c in the questionnaire, Appendix B.



#### IV. Summary

In an earlier chapter in which we examined the different role perceptions of our respondents we noted how relatively infrequently English and French-speaking M.P.s differed in their responses. When we came to explore the manner in which respondents perform their roles, particularly as this relates to maintaining links with their constituencies, we noted more clearly defined differences on the basis of the respondent's mother tongue. In this chapter we have encountered further evidence of a similar pattern: English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s appear not to differ at all as far as their perceptions of the place of the backbencher in the legislative process are concerned; but with regard to their general orientations to political life, and their attitudes to Parliament and parliamentary reforms, there are very clear differences between the members of the two principal language groups. Differences based on the respondent's mother tongue were not the only distinguishing features we encountered; particularly on matters involving attitudes towards Parliament or party caucus we found that the major factor distinguishing respondents was their parties. In several cases, then, the key distinctions were between government and opposition parties, but overall the dichotomy between English and French-speaking respondents is fundamental.

The basic difference in attitudes between respondents from the two principal language groups was never better revealed than in the responses to the questions dealing with the proposed reforms of Parliament. French-speaking M.P.s were considerably more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to say that the House of Commons is ineffective, but when we pursued their specific complaints with the House of Commons as such, their major reform proposals seemed to amount to only two: procedural changes, and improvement



of the personnel of Parliament. However, when we sought respondents' reactions to specific reform proposals, such as reducing the number of M.P.s and providing those remaining with paid assistants, alternating the leadership of political parties between the two principal language groups on a regular basis, and establishing a second chamber equally representative of French and English-speaking Canadians, French-speaking respondents were considerably more inclined to agree than their English-speaking colleagues.

The differences in general orientation to politics were neither as sharply defined as those dealing with suggested reforms of Parliament, nor as insignificant as those dealing with general perceptions of the place of the backbencher in the policy-making process. French-speaking M.P.s are just as disposed as English-speaking M.P.s to say that being an M.P. is a full-time job, but French-speaking M.P.s are a little more inclined to spend time in their constituencies while the parliamentary session is in progress. French-speaking M.P.s were also: more inclined to say that they would be running again for Parliament; more inclined to say that M.P.s lose money in politics; more inclined to say that M.P.s are underpaid; and more inclined to say that they have an interest in a public office other than a cabinet post sometime in the future. French-speaking M.P.s were also more inclined to say that their reason for staying on in politics is to try to finish the job which they began; English-speaking M.P.s on the other hand were more inclined to say simply that they enjoy the life. French-speaking M.P.s were not only less disposed to say that they like the life but, in answer to the question about what they would miss most if they left parliamentary life suddenly, many more French-speaking than English-speaking M.P.s said they would miss nothing.





Something of this latter attitude is reflected in the responses of French-speaking M.P.s to questions relating to the performance of their roles as M.P.s. French-speaking respondents were more inclined to say that they have no particular political interests; they were also less inclined to say that they are interested in committee work. Moreover, in pursuit of their particular political interests the styles of M.P.s from the two principal language groups differ: English-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to say that they would do research on the matter and that they would follow up their interest at the committee level. French-speaking M.P.s, on the other hand are more disposed to try to talk to the Minister concerned with the problem. There is at least one good reason why some of these differences should appear between the two groups of respondents: the one problem of performing one's job that is unique for French-speaking M.P.s is the problem of language that is encountered in dealings with the Civil Service, and in participating in committees in which the major part of the proceedings, and the documents provided, are in English. Many French-speaking respondents were anxious to relieve both of these problems by making the Civil Service fully bilingual and by improving the translation and stenographic facilities provided within committees.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, we may note that the mother tongue of the respondent was also the most distinguishing factor in the analysis of M.P.'s perceptions of the qualities of a "good M.P.". In this case it was observed that both language groups were agreed in attributing greatest importance to a set of desirable personal characteristics (honesty, patience, etc) and the ability

---

<sup>27</sup>

See below, Chapter Eight.



to work hard. The two groups differed mainly to the extent that English-speaking M.P.s also mentioned other important qualities, such as expertise, and devotion to the job. These differences in perception, interestingly enough, were not noted by our respondents: the vast majority agreed that there were no differences in the perceptions of the qualities of a good M.P. between M.P.s from different parties or different provinces or on any other grounds. It is worth keeping this point in mind as we examine further M.P.s' perceptions of each other.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### ATTITUDES, COMMUNICATION AND THE PERCEPTION OF OTHERS

#### 1. Attitudes

It has already been established that Canadian M.P.s exhibit considerable variety in the perception of their roles as Members of Parliament and in the manner in which they go about performing these roles. Differences of perception based on language orientation seem most significant, but often differences of party, or region, emerge as important too. Surprisingly, the location of the M.P.s' constituencies (i.e. urban or rural) appears to count for little in the Canadian system.

The differences have appeared in an analysis of the Member's perception of his own role, or his own manner of coping with that role as he sees it. The study was concerned, however, with more than this: we wanted to discover also how M.P.s perceived other M.P.s, their roles, and the manner in which others performed their roles. To this end a number of questions were designed to focus specifically on differences of perception, and especially on those differences of role perception and performance which were related to differences in language orientation.

One question dealt solely with the attitudes of English-speaking M.P.s towards French Canadians since they became M.P.s; the comparable question in the French language questionnaire sought attitudes towards English Canadians:





37. a) Has your general attitude towards French Canadians  
(English Canadians) changed since you became an M.P.?  
b) (IF SO) How has it changed?  
c) What has contributed to the change?

Although the first part of the question did not call for an explanation of the respondent's position if his attitude had not changed, most respondents sufficiently elaborated on negative replies to allow us to determine whether the attitude was in fact "unchanged-sympathetic" or "unchanged-unsympathetic".

The contrast between French-speaking respondents and English-speaking respondents is striking. Nearly 25% of the English respondents indicated that they were unsympathetic to French Canadians; only one French-speaking respondent was unsympathetic (he had not changed his attitude towards English Canadians since he became an M.P. but had been unsympathetic before entering Parliament). However, whereas a little more than 20% of the English-speaking M.P.s had become less sympathetic to French Canadians since they had entered Parliament, another 30% stated that they had become more sympathetic. The largest group of respondents among the English-speaking M.P.s was unchanged in its sympathies towards French Canadians; the smallest group of English-speaking respondents was unchanged in its unsympathetic attitude towards French Canadians. Lying between these two groups were two others whose attitudes had changed since going to Ottawa, the one having become more sympathetic, the other less.

The difference between English and French-speaking respondents is clear enough; but there were also clear differences in attitudes within the English-speaking group. The most striking difference was in regional terms. Of the twenty "unsympathetic M.P.s", 14 came from either British



Table 7.1

Attitudes of English-Speaking M.P.s Towards French Canadians  
and Attitudes of French-Speaking M.P.s Towards English  
Canadians After Entering Parliament (vertical %)

	<u>English-speaking M.P.s</u>	<u>French-speaking M.P.s</u>
unchanged sympathetic	45.8	70.1
became more sympathetic	30.1	26.4
unchanged unsympathetic	3.2	3.0
became less sympathetic	20.4	0.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	83	34

Columbia or the Prairies, with the Prairie Conservatives accounting for the bulk of these.

Table 7.2

Attitudes to French Canadians (English-Speaking  
Respondents only) by Region (horizontal %)

	<u>sympathetic</u>	<u>unsympathetic</u>
B.C./Yukon	63.6	36.4
Prairies/NWT	47.4	52.6
Ontario	87.9	12.1
Quebec	100.0	0.0
Maritimes	86.7	13.3
	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	63	20



There were also, as implied, differences along party lines. Nearly 90% of the English Liberals were sympathetic, as compared with 66% of the English Conservatives and 77% of the N.D.P. Looked at in another way, of the 20 English Canadians who stated they were unsympathetic towards French Canadians, 12 (60%) were Conservatives. The numbers are admittedly small, but taking into account some of the attitudes expressed by Conservatives who refused to participate in the survey, there is little reason to think that the findings from the sample exaggerate the measure of the unsympathetic attitude towards French Canadians among Conservative M.P.s. The third part of the question, seeking information on the causes of change in attitude, did not collect replies from a majority of respondents, since less than a majority of respondents indicated that their opinions had changed; but the results are nevertheless important.

## II. Communication

For those whose attitude had changed in the direction of greater sympathy with French Canadians there can be no doubt that personal contact with French Canadians was the most important reason given. A few also mentioned other causes, such as the respondent's greater facility in the French language, or the respondent's greater knowledge of the problems of French Canadians; but for every M.P. at least one explanation of attitude change was similar to the following offered by a British Columbia Liberal:

I'd say I have more understanding because of contact with articulate French Canadians. It's much more a matter of discussion since I became an M.P.

For those who became less sympathetic there were two main reasons: reaction to the increasing demands of French Canadians (particularly for





greater use of French within the House of Commons), and irritation with the behaviour of certain French Canadian Members in the House or committees. One M.P. explained his unsympathetic attitude towards French Canadians in terms of "the discrimination against English civil servants"; another mentioned his "impatience with the French Canadians who place the blame for their ills on the federal government"; a few others seem to have got off to a bad start in Ottawa when no French Canadians took up their offers to share an office with them. But for most of those who had become unsympathetic the reason was similar to that given by a Social Credit M.P.: "the unreasonable and unrelenting pressure to insist on the French language where it has no practical use". Earlier in the interview the same M.P. had complained that bilingualism was "very expensive, and very time consuming". He added:

It is very frustrating when members insist on having everything done in both languages simply for that sake. In some committees a French-speaking M.P. who can speak English well, even if he knows there aren't enough translators to go around, will insist on adjourning just to prove his point.

Table 7.3

Reasons Offered by English-Speaking M.P.s for Becoming  
Unsympathetic to French Canadians (absolute numbers)

	<u>no. mentioning</u>
increasing demands of French Canada	14
behaviour of French Canadian members in House or committee	11
personal contact	2
other	4



Although personal contact between French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s did not in every case lead to greater sympathy on the part of English Canadians, it was an important factor in the warming attitude of the vast majority. The same was true for those French-speaking M.P.s who had become more sympathetic to English Canadians. Not all of the French-speaking M.P.s who have become more sympathetic gave reasons for their change in attitude, but the most important single factor mentioned was personal contact with English-speaking M.P.s.<sup>1</sup>

Answers to other questions also bolster the suggestion implicit in the results just given that personal or informal contact with other M.P.s is more important in creating sympathy for a point of view than in creating antagonism for a point of view. The specific additional questions were these:

28 b) Can you give any examples of occasions on which, from your own experience, informal contacts with other M.P.s have

i) actually made you more sympathetic to a view to which you were originally opposed?

ii) ...made you less sympathetic?

Only about one-third of the M.P.s (equal proportions from each of the two language groups) gave examples of occasions on which informal contacts led to greater sympathy, and only about one-quarter (again roughly

---

<sup>1</sup>Two other reasons given were: (1) that the demands of Quebec seemed to be getting through to English-speaking M.P.s; (2) that the English-speaking M.P.s are trying to learn to speak French.

There were only 9 French-speaking M.P.s (26.4%) who stated that they had become more sympathetic, the vast majority being "unchanged-sympathetic". Five of the nine respondents mentioned "personal contact" as the reason for the change in attitude. Two respondents gave no answer to this question.



equal proportions of the two groups) gave examples of becoming less sympathetic; but we obtained enough responses of a less specific nature to compare the two groups in terms of their disposition to say whether informal contacts do or do not have an effect on their point of view.

The majority of M.P.s agree that informal contacts make for greater sympathy with others' points of view, the French-speaking M.P.s being somewhat less inclined than the English-speaking M.P.s to agree. The M.P.s are rather less inclined to say that informal contacts have the effect of making them less sympathetic. In this instance there seems to be some difference between French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s. Whereas English-speaking M.P.s are almost equally divided between those who state that they have become unsympathetic as the result of informal contacts and those who have not, 63.4% of the French-speaking say they have not. One should not make too much of the small differences between the English-speaking and French-speaking respondents, especially since a rather large number of "No answers" were recorded for these questions by French-speaking respondents<sup>2</sup>, but the direction of the difference (i.e. in the tendency for French-speaking M.P.s, as compared with English-speaking, somewhat to under-rate the importance of informal contacts as an agency of opinion change) is the same for both questions. It remains to be examined whether this tendency is based on the fact that French-speaking M.P.s experience fewer informal contacts; or whether, given the same degree of contact, they nevertheless tend to stick more to their original points of view.

---

<sup>2</sup>Five of the "No Answers" resulted from one interviewer's refusal to ask respondents the two questions, although in every other respect his interviewing was satisfactory. "No answers" totalled 16.2% and 18.9% of the French-speaking sample.





Table 7.4

Respondents Stating That Informal Contacts Between M.P.s Make for <u>Greater Sympathy (% horizontal)</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
English	71.2	28.8
French	<u>61.3</u>	<u>38.7</u>
N =	80	31
<u>Less Sympathy (% horizontal)</u>		
English	50.6	49.4
French	<u>36.7</u>	<u>63.4</u>
N =	77	30

What has clearly been established thus far is this: personal or informal contacts have a part to play in the creation of M.P.s' attitudes towards each other and the ideas which they support. It is therefore important to examine, especially with regard to the creation of attitudes within the two major language groups, whether M.P.s think there are any problems of communication between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s.

Thirty per cent of the M.P.s believe that there is no problem of communication between French and English-speaking M.P.s, and there is no real difference in opinion here between M.P.s of the two major language groups.<sup>2b</sup> The only important difference that was found as a result of

---

<sup>2b</sup>Younger M.P.s, (i.e. under 34) were more inclined to recognize a problem than the oldest members: only 16.7% of the former group said there was no problem, whereas 41.7% of the latter said there was no problem.



analysis of the language orientation of respondents was the tendency of French-speaking M.P.s (21.6%) to mention lack of contact as hindering communication between the two language groups more often than English-speaking M.P.s (6.1%). Twenty-eight per cent of the respondents mentioned ignorance of the other's language as a factor contributing to the problem of communication; 7.6% mentioned cultural differences, and 22.7% mentioned other factors (usually a combination of language and cultural differences).

It is important to note that while much of the apparent difference between English and French-speaking M.P.s with regard to lack of contact is accounted for by the considerable disposition of the Cr ditistes (two-thirds of the sample of Cr ditistes) to mention lack of contact as a problem, differences are also noticeable within the Liberal Party as between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s. French-speaking Liberals are less inclined to see no problem, and more inclined to mention the problem of lack of contact, than their English-speaking cohorts.

Table 7.5

Responses of French-Speaking and English-Speaking  
Liberals to Question on Problems of Communication  
between French-Speaking and English-Speaking M.P.s  
(horizontal %)\*

	<u>no problem</u>	<u>language</u>	<u>cultural</u> <u>differences</u>	<u>lack of</u> <u>contact</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>N</u>
English	35.1	35.1	0.0	5.4	24.3	(37)
French	24.0	28.0	12.0	16.0	20.0	(25)

\* Responses are derived from the two parts of question 29a.



When the responses are analysed by party some interesting differences emerge. In this case there are no significant differences between the two major parties, and the differences are even less when one looks only at the English-speaking members of the Liberal and Conservative parties. Liberals are more inclined to mention ignorance of the other's language alone as contributing to the problem of communication, whereas Conservatives are more inclined to see the problem as a combination of language and cultural factors, but otherwise the differences are slight. But genuine differences are apparent between M.P.s of the two major parties, on the one hand, and M.P.s from the minor parties in the House of Commons on the other. All Social Credit M.P.s felt there was a problem of communication, three-fifths putting the blame on language differences. The Cr ditistes, as already noted, mentioned particularly the problem of lack of contact between English and French-speaking M.P.s. The N.D.P. Members were not much different in their responses from M.P.s from the two older parties, except that they were somewhat more inclined to mention language problems as the key factor in the problem of communication.

In many ways regional differences in the responses to the question of a problem of communication are the most important. British Columbia Members are the most inclined to say that a problem exists, with the language factor being uppermost for the majority. Prairie M.P.s (47.4%) are most inclined to say that no problem exists. When it is recalled that there were no significant differences between the Conservatives and Liberal parties (especially between the English-speaking members thereof), the importance of this point of view of many Prairie Members (who are predominately Conservative) is reinforced. No fewer than 50% of the Prairie





Conservatives thought there was no problem of communication. An attempt is made later to ascertain whether this opinion is based on successfully overcoming the problem of communication which other members found important, or whether it results from not trying to communicate at all.

Finally, it is interesting to note the responses of M.P.s from the three other regions. Maritime M.P.s and Quebec M.P.s were exactly the same in their disposition to note a problem of communication (one quarter of each group said there was no problem), but they differed in the factors selected as contributing to the problem: Maritime M.P.s tended to emphasize the problem of language, while Quebec M.P.s singled out the problem of lack of contact. Ontario M.P.s (and especially Ontario Liberals) were more inclined than Quebec and Maritime Members to feel that there was no problem of communication, and for those who did think there was a problem a great many found the explanation in terms of language and cultural differences between the two groups.

Table 7.6

Responses of M.P.s to Question on Problem of  
Communication Between English-Speaking and French-  
Speaking M.P.s, Analysed by Region (horizontal %)

	<u>no problem</u>	<u>language problem</u>	<u>cultural differences</u>	<u>lack of contact</u>	<u>other</u>
B.C./Yukon	9.1	63.6	9.1	9.1	9.1
Prairies/NWT	47.4	21.1	15.8	5.3	10.5
Ontario	35.1	29.7	0.0	5.4	29.7
Quebec	25.0	19.4	11.1	22.2	22.2
Maritimes	25.0	31.3	6.3	6.3	31.3
N =	36	34	9	13	27*

\* 21 of the 27 "others" gave answers pointing to a combination of language and cultural differences as the source of the problem of communication.



M.P.s who stated that there was a problem of communication between English and French Canadians were asked whether they saw any solutions to the problem. Since roughly 30% of the respondents did not think there was any problem, the suggested solutions are presented here as percentages of the respondents within a group who saw a problem of communication, and not as a percentage of the entire group. Because M.P.s often mentioned more than one solution the total percentage adds up to more than 100%.

About 18% of the M.P.s answering the question thought that there was no solution to the problem of communication. The proportions were roughly equal from English and French-speaking respondents. Although there were no significant differences in this respect between respondents from the two principal language groups (just as there had been no difference in their disposition to recognize a problem) there were clear differences in the solutions which they proposed. French-speaking M.P.s were far more inclined than English-speaking to mention "efforts to mix with the other language group" as the solution to the problem; they were relatively less inclined to mention language lessons and the use of translation services. English-speaking respondents who proposed solutions to the problem of communication favoured language lessons, and were considerably less disposed than French-speaking respondents to mention the desirability of greater mixing between the two groups: 63% of the French-speaking respondents offering solutions mentioned the idea; only 20.3% of the English-speaking respondents did so.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>These differences in proposed solutions are clearly seen between English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals. 63.1% of the French-speaking Liberals replying to the question mentioned mixing with the other language group as a solution; only 11.5% of the English-speaking Liberals mentioned this solution. 57.7% of the English-speaking Liberals mentioned language lessons; only 21% of the French-speaking Liberals put forward the same solution.



Table 7.7

Proposed Solutions to Problem of Communication Mentioned  
by English-Speaking and French-Speaking M.P.s Recognizing  
the Problem (horizontal %)

	there is no solution	language lessons	mixing with other language group	translation devices	* other
English	20.3	40.6	20.3	23.7	35.6
French	14.9	18.5	63.0	7.4	18.5
N =	16	29	29	16	26

\* 5 English-speaking M.P.s mentioned that an extra effort to read about Quebec affairs was a solution; 7 English-speaking M.P.s said that discussion of the subject was helping; only one English-speaking M.P. offered the solution that French Canadians simply assimilate.

There were no significant differences in responses when analysed by the urban/rural location of the M.P.'s constituency, and generally speaking the differences between the parties followed the differences between the two principal language groups. It is worth noting that Conservatives (who were no less inclined than Liberals to recognize a problem of communication) were more inclined to think that there were no solutions to the problem: 32% of the Conservatives and only 13.5% of the Liberals who were asked for solutions to the problem gave a pessimistic answer. Also, when the proposed solutions of English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives are compared, language lessons emerge as far more important for Liberals (57.7% of the English-speaking Liberals who were asked mentioned this solution) than for Conservatives (only 17% of the





English-speaking Conservatives who were asked mentioned it.)

When the responses are examined regionally one further interesting fact emerges: there seems to be a parallel between the disposition of M.P.s from the different regions to recognize a problem of communication and the disposition of M.P.s from the same region to think that a solution to the problem can be found. Prairie M.P.s were most inclined to say that there is no problem of communication, and among those who think that there is a problem of communication Prairie M.P.s are the most inclined to think there is no solution. British Columbia M.P.s, on the other hand, were most disposed to see a problem; they were also the most disposed to think that there were solutions to the problem of communication.

Table 7.8

Comparison, by Regions, of Respondents Thinking  
There is No Problem of Communication with Res-  
pondents Who, Recognizing There is a Problem,  
Feel There is No Solution to the Problem

	<u>% of respondents saying there is no problem of communication</u>	<u>% of respondents recognizing problem of communication but be- lieving there is no solution to the problem</u>
B.C./Yukon	9.1	0.0
Prairies/NWT	47.4	40.0
Ontario	35.1	22.0
Quebec	25.0	18.5
Maritimes	25.0	8.2



It is not suggested that there is any causal relationship between these two sets of facts: they must be taken merely as adding further descriptive evidence of the attitudes of Members in the different regions towards communication between M.P.s of the two principal language groups. It is worth noting that Prairie M.P.s were the least inclined of any from the predominantly English-speaking provinces to think that language lessons had anything to contribute to the solution to the problem of communication.

It has already been established that informal contacts between M.P.s can be important as a mechanism of opinion change; we also saw that, for most of those whose attitude towards the other language group had become more sympathetic, personal contact loomed as important. Although nearly a third of the French Canadian and English Canadian M.P.s were agreed that there is no problem of communication, a significant number of French-speaking M.P.s pointed to lack of contact with English-speaking M.P.s as a problem. French Canadians were also much more disposed to see the efforts to mix with the other language group as working towards a solution to the problem, whereas the English-speaking M.P.s tended to mention language lessons and translation facilities as solutions to the problem. The solutions suggested are functional for both groups: for the French-speaking the problem seems to be one of contact; for the English-speaking the problem is seen as one of language, or language and cultural differences.

In order to pursue further the process of attitude formation and change it is necessary to examine the pattern of friendship links within the House of Commons, as part of the process of informal contact to which we have been referring. We will also examine the disposition of Members to turn to other M.P.s, whether or not they happen to be friends, for a



better understanding of the English Canadian or French Canadian point of view.

It must be recalled at this point that we were not as successful as we had hoped in getting Members to name their closest parliamentary friends, i.e. the Members they most often see outside the Chamber, at lunch or dinner, or at parties or social gatherings.<sup>4</sup> Sixty per cent of the sample did mention the name of at least one friend; still others gave some information about the nature of their parliamentary friendships without revealing names. However, the pattern of refusals was not completely random: there were no significant differences in the pattern of refusals to name friends in terms of analysis by urban/rural location of the M.P.'s constituency, or language orientation, but there were differences on the basis of party and region. Liberals (both English and French-speaking) were more inclined to name friends than Conservatives (68.8% as compared to 51.4%) and Prairie M.P.s (mainly Conservatives) were far more inclined to refuse than M.P.s from any other region.<sup>5</sup> For this reason it was not possible to set out the friendship links, in terms of named friends, for the entire House of Commons. However, because of the larger number of Liberal respondents to begin with, and because of their better than average cooperation in naming friends, it is possible to say something about the patterns of friendship within the government party.

Fundamentally, close friendships within the Liberal Party follow

---

<sup>4</sup> See above, Chapter Three, Section II (6)

<sup>5</sup> 63.2% of the Prairie M.P.s refused to name a friend; the refusal rate over the entire sample was 39.3%.





regional and language lines, moderated only by the presence of a few key personalities who seem to bridge the gap between the two principal language groups as well as the parties. The Quebec caucus seems to be made up of a number of interpenetrating islands of French-speaking friendship groups linked with English-speaking groups of the same party through a very few younger bilingual M.P.s, who not only name English-speaking Liberals as their friends but are in turn named by English-speaking M.P.s as friends. The younger English-speaking M.P.s, who seem to form the other part of the bridge, are themselves most frequently named by English-speaking M.P.s as close friends. The friendship links between the French-speaking and English-speaking Liberals are few in number: the links consist of a half dozen popular M.P.s of the two principal language groups whose friendship choices are reciprocated.

It is possible to go a little further with our data on the question of friendship links, although it is unfortunately not possible to say too much more about the tendency of friendships to bridge language group lines. There were only eight M.P.s who refused to give us any information about their friends in the House: most would at least say whether their friends came from the same party or region, or whether they had no friends at all. Such information permitted us to code respondents in terms of: "friends in own party and own region"; "friends in own party"; "no limitations of party or region on friendships"; "no friends" and "other." The results, analysed in terms of the principal language group of respondents, are as follows:



Table 7.9

Closest Friends of Respondents, Analysed by  
M.P.s' Principal Language Group (horizontal %)

	<u>in own party/ region</u>	<u>in own party</u>	<u>no limitations</u>	<u>no friends</u>	<u>other</u>
English	7.7	29.5	33.3	9.0	20.5
French	36.1	27.8	27.8	2.8	5.6
N =	19	33	36	8	18

The figures given suggest one important difference between the English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s: French-speaking M.P.s are far more inclined to choose friends from their own party and own region. But we must not make more of this difference than is warranted. The figures tend to confirm what our analysis of friendships within the Liberal party has already suggested (that a large number of French Canadians have no friendships outside their own cultural group) but they do not, on the other hand, so clearly affirm the notion that English-speaking M.P.s' friendships are more inclined to cross cultural lines. It is fairly certain, when French-speaking respondents reply that their friendships are mainly in their own party and own region, that these friendships are generally with other French-speaking M.P.s. But it is not so clear, when English-speaking M.P.s say that their friends come from their own region, or that they are friends with M.P.s who "share their own interests", that any of these friends are necessarily French-speaking M.P.s; it is precisely this type of answer (classed as "other" in table 7.9) which makes up the difference between French and English-speaking respondents. Even when M.P.s say, as did



roughly 30% of the M.P.s of both principal language groups, that their friends come from their own party, it is impossible to assert that these friends are drawn proportionately from the two language groups within the same party. The only non-parochial respondents were those who stated that their friendships were not bound by party or geographical limitations, and these were only a little more prevalent among the English-speaking M.P.s. Overall, we are entitled to draw only the following conclusions: the data do not permit us to state the measure of the propensity of the different language groups to seek friends outside their own language group, but we can say that French-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to choose friends solely from their own region;<sup>6</sup> English-speaking M.P.s, while perhaps no more inclined to cross language lines, are less disposed to choose friends within their own region. The fact that the bulk of the French-speaking M.P.s come from one province, while English-speaking M.P.s are spread through all provinces, accounts for the difference between the two language groups, but it does not dispose of the fact that the friendships of many French-speaking M.P.s have a parochial character: not only do their friends come from the same language group, but from the same province as well.

Friendship offers a means, often most subtle, by which opinions are created; but it is only one means. M.P.s might also rely on informal contact with other M.P.s (not necessarily their closest friends, but people to whom they might be inclined to turn for advice, information or merely

---

<sup>6</sup>These differences between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s were revealed within the Liberal Party; only 8.3% of the English-speaking Liberals said that their friends came from the same party and region as compared with 40% of the French-speaking Liberals.





an expression of opinion) in making up their minds on many issues. To get at this relationship between M.P.s we asked respondents a question bearing directly on the particular problem of English-French relations:

29 (d) What M.P.s do you tend to turn to for a deeper understanding of the French Canadian (English Canadian) point of view?

Respondents were urged to mention at least three names, or "contacts".

Nearly three-fifths of the M.P.s were able to name at least one contact. Just over 40% of the M.P.s refused to answer the question, or stated that there were no such contacts to whom they would be likely to turn.<sup>7</sup> It is interesting that, although French-speaking M.P.s appear to be somewhat more disposed to seek out contacts, the differences between the two principal language groups are not statistically significant.

Table 7.10

English-Speaking and French-Speaking M.P.s Mentioning  
Useful Contact(s) For Better Understanding of Point of  
View (horizontal %)

	<u>Mentioned contacts</u>	<u>did not mention contacts</u>
English	54.1	45.9
French	67.6	32.4

The difference between English-speaking and French-speaking Liberals is a

---

<sup>7</sup> Thirteen English-speaking M.P.s stated explicitly that there was nobody to whom they would turn for a better understanding of the French Canadian point of view, but further analysis showed that there was no difference in their disposition to mention contacts between those who were sympathetic to French Canadians and those who were unsympathetic.



little sharper. Whereas some 68% of the French-speaking Liberals were disposed to seek out contacts and named at least one person to whom they turned, only 48% of the English-speaking Liberals did so. The unwillingness (or inability) to mention a contact was especially noticeable among Ontario Liberals, over 50% of whom said they made no contacts.

Differences between the parties were insignificant, except for the fact that all M.P.s in the Social Credit Party mentioned a contact. The regional differences were more noteworthy: Quebec and Maritime M.P.s were most disposed to seek out opinions from other M.P.s; Ontario, Prairie and British Columbia M.P.s were somewhat less disposed.

Table 7.11

M.P.s Mentioning Useful Contacts for Understanding

Point of View, Analysed by Region (horizontal %)

	<u>Mentioned contacts</u>	<u>did not mention contacts</u>
B.C./Yukon	45.5	54.5
Prairies/NWT	52.6	47.4
Ontario	50.0	50.0
Quebec	69.4	30.6
Maritimes	68.8	31.3

Who are the key "contacts" for M.P.s of the two language groups? Because we are dealing with a sample of the membership in the first place, and because some M.P.s who presumably might have such contacts refused to tell us who they are, it would be wrong to attribute too much quantitative significance to the names mentioned. But because we are dealing with such a large sample of the membership, and because a fairly considerable number



of members mentioned at least one contact, it is certainly worthwhile to present the results of the analysis.

Not surprisingly, the vast majority of the useful contacts come from the M.P.s' own parties, and this was true for both French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s. The main exceptions to this were of course the Social Credit Rally and the N.D.P., neither of which has members of both language groups within the same party. To whom did these M.P.s tend to turn? The Cr ditistes appeared equally disposed to turn to Liberals and Conservatives, with no single individual in either party being preferred. The N.D.P. Members, on the other hand, turned to French-speaking Liberals and Cr ditistes, with Gilles Gr goire and Jean Chr tien being mentioned more often than others.

For English-speaking Conservatives by far the most important single individual turned to for a better understanding of the French Canadian point of view was Paul Martineau. Clement Vincent was next most frequently mentioned, with L on Balcer, Th og ne Ricard (equally mentioned), Heward Grafftey and Georges Valade following in that order. For English-speaking Liberals Jean Chr tien was the most frequently mentioned contact. Maurice Sauv , Jean-Luc P pin, Maurice Rinfret, John Turner, Bryce Mackasey, and Bernard Pilon (in that order) also received plural mention as individuals sought out for their point of view. Mackasey and Turner are particularly interesting here because both were mentioned several times by English-speaking M.P.s as contacts for a French Canadian point of view, and also as contacts for French-speaking M.P.s seeking an English Canadian point of view.

Mainly because of the small number of French-speaking Conservatives





involved, no single English-speaking Conservative emerged as the counterpart of Paul Martineau. Nor, for French-speaking Liberals, is there any single individual as overwhelmingly prominent as a contact as Jean Chrétien. French-speaking Liberals appear to have a number of "English Canadian contacts", with Lloyd Francis, John Turner, Ron Basford, Richard Cashin, Grant Deachman, Bryce Mackasey, Marvin Gelber, Jack Pickersgill, Maurice Moreau, and Pauline Jewett (in that order) receiving plural mention. French-speaking Social Credit M.P.s appear to turn to M.P.s from any party, with no particular individual preferred.

Taking together what we know of the pattern of friendship links within the Liberal party, as well as the data on contacts, the key position of Jean Chrétien in the informal network of the backbench Liberals emerges as very significant. Not only is Jean Chrétien the key French Canadian in the bridge between English-speaking and French-speaking friendships groups among Liberal backbenchers, he is also an esteemed source of opinions on the French Canadian point of view.

Throughout the analysis of contacts it has been assumed that the disposition of a Member to mention at least one other M.P. to whom he turns for "a deeper understanding" of the French Canadian (or English Canadian) point of view, can be taken as a rough measure of his interest in the matter of relations between the two language groups. This may not always be the case: a Member may be interested in the matter but nevertheless feel that his own expertise and experience make it unnecessary to seek out further opinions from his colleagues. Such a position is not so likely, however, with regard to the point of view of writers, editorialists and social scientists. Few interested individuals, even if they have a good deal of personal knowledge, will be indifferent to the opinions expressed



by controversial personalities. In order, then, to find a further measure of interest and concern for the question of relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada among M.P.s and also to find out what personalities in Canada are important in shaping opinion on the subject, we asked all M.P.s the following question:

- 29 (e) Are there any personalities (writers, editorialists, social scientists, politicians) whose point of view you listen to with respect and interest on the subject of relations between English and French-speaking Canada?

If the M.P. is at all interested in the problem, there must be some views to which he listens with respect and interest, even if he rejects many others.<sup>8</sup>

Once more, nearly 60% of our sample named at least one personality whose views were listened to with interest and respect. Once again there were no significant differences between M.P.s on the basis of the urban/rural location of their constituencies. Nor were there any really significant differences between the parties. The N.D.P. Members were least inclined to mention personalities, but when the N.D.P. (an all English-speaking party) is compared with the English-speaking M.P.s of the Liberal and Conservative parties, the differences are not important. By implication, the major differences are those of the language group of the respondent: French-speaking M.P.s were much more inclined than English-speaking M.P.s to mention personalities listened to for their contribution

---

<sup>8</sup> It was not always easy to judge whether, when a respondent merely said "I read them all", he was particularly interested in the matter. If, at the same time, he was unable to mention a specific personality he was coded as "no mention", and is thereby considered as unconcerned with the subject.



to the discussion of the relations between English and French-speaking.

Table 7.12

French-Speaking and English-Speaking M.P.s  
Mentioning Personalities Respected for Views on  
Relations Between English-Speaking and French-  
Speaking Canada. (horizontal %)

	<u>Mentioned personality</u>	<u>Did not mention personality</u>
English	50.6	49.4
French	<u>81.1</u>	<u>18.9</u>
N =	73	49

These differences on the basis of language are revealed within the same political party. The following table compares the English and French-speaking M.P.s of the Conservative and Liberal parties in terms of their disposition to mention personalities.

Table 7.13

French-Speaking and English-Speaking Liberals and  
Conservatives Mentioning Personalities Respected for  
Views on Relations Between English-Speaking and French-  
Speaking Canada. (horizontal %)

	Yes*	<u>English</u> No	N	Yes	<u>French</u> No	N
Liberals	51.3	48.9	39	80.0	20.0	25
Conservatives	54.3	45.7	35	100.0	0.0	2

\* i.e. Did mention a personality.





Even more interesting than these differences, however, are the variations between M.P.s when looked at by regions. One would expect to find a difference between Quebec, with its large number of French-speaking M.P.s, and the rest of the country. But once more there are also clear differences within the other regions as well.

Table 7.14

M.P.s Mentioning Personalities Respected For Views on  
Relations Between English-Speaking and French-Speaking  
Canada, by Region (horizontal %)

	<u>mentioned personality</u>	<u>Did not mention personality</u>
B.C./Yukon	54.5	45.5
Prairies/N.W.T.	36.8	63.2
Ontario	37.5	62.5
Quebec	86.1	13.9
Maritimes	87.5	12.5

The regional differences present here, showing the apparently high level of interest of Maritime M.P.s and the relatively low interest of Prairie and Ontario M.P.s, exist within both major parties.



Table 7.15

Liberal and Conservative M.P.s Mentioning Personalities  
Respected for Views on Relations between English-Speaking  
and French-Speaking Canada, by Region

	<u>Liberals</u>	<u>Conservatives</u>
B.C./Yukon	33.1	100.0
Prairies	*	37.5
Ontario	40.7	33.3
Quebec	87.0	100.0
Maritimes	80.0	100.0

\* only 1 respondent

Finally we may note that there is a relationship between sympathy with French Canadians and disposition to mention personalities, although the difference between sympathetic and unsympathetic English-speaking M.P.s in this regard is not great: 55% of the English-speaking M.P.s who said they were sympathetic to French Canadians mentioned personalities, whereas only 35% of those who were unsympathetic did so.

Let us now look at the personalities mentioned by respondents. Seventy-three respondents mentioned at least one personality; several M.P.s mentioned as many as six. The interesting fact that emerges from the results is, however, that there is only one figure mentioned by anything like a majority of the respondents answering the question: Claude Ryan. Forty-seven (64%) of the answering respondents (75% of the French-speaking M.P.s and 57% of the English-speaking M.P.s) mentioned the editor of Le Devoir as a person respected for his views on the subject of relations



between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada. The next highest-ranked personalities were Marcel Faribault, Gerald Pelletier and André Laurendeau, who each received mention from a little more than 12% of the answering respondents. The clear prominence of Quebec journalists within the nominated opinion-leading group offers an implicit comment on the status of English newspapermen and Canadian universities which both would do well to note.

Still within the highest-ranked personalities, but insignificant by comparison with Mr. Ryan, were a number of politicians. Mr. Pearson was mentioned by seven French-speaking M.P.s, but by only one English-speaking. René Lévesque, on the other hand, was mentioned by four English-speaking M.P.s and only two French-speaking. Maurice Sauvé and Guy Favreau achieved equal mention, three each from French-speaking and three each from English-speaking M.P.s. (Table 7.16 gives the names of the top-ranked personalities.)

The data presented in this chapter seem to suggest that although, as a group, French-speaking M.P.s are no more convinced than English-speaking M.P.s of a problem of communication between English and French Canadians, those who do see a problem tend to point more often than English-speaking M.P.s to the lack of contact. We noticed earlier that both French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s whose attitudes towards each other had become more sympathetic mentioned personal contact with the other language group as an important explanation. On the other hand we noted that French Canadian M.P.s seemed less open to attitude change as a result of informal contact with other M.P.s, and we considered whether this could be explained by their having fewer informal contacts with other M.P.s. Further analysis revealed that the answer was not to be found in the frequency of contacts.





Table 7.16

Personalities Respected for Views on Relations  
Between English-Speaking and French-Speaking Canada

Name	Number of times mentioned by		
	English	French	Total
C. Ryan	25	22	47
M. Faribault	5	4	9
G. Pelletier	4	5	9
A. Laurendeau	3	6	9
L. Pearson	1	7	8
L. Pare	0	8	8
J.L. Pepin	0	7	7
M. Sauve	3	3	6
G. Favreau	3	3	6
R. Levesque	4	2	6
Abbé Groulx	1	5	6
C. Lynch	4	1	5
M. Lamontagne	1	4	5
A. Blakely	3	1	4
P. Desbarats	4	0	4
P. Newman	2	2	4
V. Prince	0	4	4
Cardinal Léger	0	4	4
? Angers	0	4	4



Might it be explained by the nature of their contacts? We noticed the tendency for French Canadian M.P.s to have, as their closest friends; M.P.s from their own province, and it may be that these more parochial friendships give rise less often to points of view different from the respondents. Not many close friendships cross the barriers of language in either language group, but English-speaking M.P.s seem more inclined to friendships that at least transcend regional ties.

If disposition to seek out contacts for an English Canadian (or French Canadian) point of view can be taken, along with the disposition to name personalities whose views are regarded with respect and interest on the subject of relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada, as an indicator of general interest in relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada, then there can be no doubt that English-speaking M.P.s are less interested than French-speaking M.P.s. The differences on this matter are even sharper when looked at by the regions.

Table 7.17

M.P.s Mentioning "Contacts" and "Personalities",  
Analysed by Regions (Measure of Interest in Question  
of Relations Between English and French Canada)

	<u>% mentioning contact</u>	<u>% mentioning personality</u>
B.C./Yukon	45.5	54.5
Prairies/N.W.T.	52.6	36.8
Ontario	50.0	37.5
Quebec	69.4	86.1
Maritimes	68.8	87.1



Clearly on both tests Quebec and Maritime M.P.s are most interested in the matter; Ontario, Prairie and British Columbia M.P.s rather less so.

These facts can also be related to variations noted earlier in attitudes towards French Canadians. Maritime M.P.s were very sympathetic; they were also the most inclined to seek out contacts and to refer to personalities whose points of view were listened to in the matter of relations between English and French-speaking Canada. Prairie M.P.s (47.4%) were the least sympathetic and the least inclined to mention personalities (although they were fractionally more inclined than either British Columbia or Ontario M.P.s to mention contacts). British Columbia M.P.s were more sympathetic than Prairie M.P.s, and more disposed to mention personalities, although least disposed to seek contacts. The position of Ontario M.P.s is in some ways the most interesting: they are just as sympathetic towards French Canadians as Maritime M.P.s, but they are almost as indifferent to the problem of relations between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada as Prairie M.P.s, and actually somewhat less inclined than Prairie M.P.s to seek out contacts with French Canadians. The indifference to contacts was particularly noticeable among Ontario M.P.s.

How to explain the position of Ontario M.P.s? Probably the explanation has something to do with their feeling of proximity to the matter. Some Ontario M.P.s expressed the view that they had no need to seek out a contact or listen to any "authority": they had enough experience of French Canadians (many of them in their own constituencies) without having to turn to others for advice or point of view. There may be other explanations as well. Ontario M.P.s, while not unsympathetic to French Canadians, may have become bored with the controversy; the mass media have given heavy coverage to the discussion of English-French relations for more than a year;





there may be no mileage to be gained in Ontario constituencies from discussion (either pro or con) on the matter of relations between the province of Ontario and Quebec (relations which, at the provincial level, appear to have been very friendly indeed); so the Member is not inclined to pay particular attention to the debate elsewhere. And finally, the Ontario M.P. may feel that he has been aware of the problem of relations between English and French Canada for a very long time: relations admittedly became excited for a while but they will tone down once again for a while; in the meantime, they may think, there is little point in concerning themselves too much with the problem.

The following responses from a number of Ontario M.P.s underline these generalizations:

[The subject of relations between English and French-speaking Canada] is not such a big problem to me. Earlier in my life I spent much time throughout Quebec. I had never heard of separatism until a few in Quebec brought it to light. M.P.s do not like this--we all feel it's a small minority getting too much publicity. The press must take great responsibility here; they are not doing as well as they should. (Liberal)

I've never really felt I've needed anyone to bolster my opinion. I hope I have an understanding of their problems. My association with them has confirmed my feeling that I've always held that they have a cause we should consider in English Canada. (Liberal)

None. Frankly, I'm not interested. (Liberal)

No. I can't say that there are. Whilst I consider their views, I think they are taking a hard line. I prefer to get down to the grass roots--to the average fellow. Intellectuals represent what may be sound and right, but not the views of the average fellow. (Conservative)

I was brought up as a Quebecker and accordingly prefer to rely on my own views on a subject which is very dear to my heart. I've spoken on it myself, have my own views and don't hunger after others. I think the crisis is over. (Liberal)



It is worth noting the relationship between the belief that there is or is not a problem of communication between French and English-speaking M.P.s, and the disposition to attempt such communication. Prairie Conservative M.P.s were the most disposed to deny a problem of communication, but they were not especially disposed to mention French-speaking contacts sought out for a French Canadian point of view. British Columbia M.P.s were most convinced of a problem of communication (one related especially to language differences) and for them the problem seems clearly manifest in the relatively low level of contact with French Canadians. Quebeckers and Maritimers were equally disposed to recognize a problem of communication (more so than the Prairie M.P.s but not so much as the M.P.s from British Columbia) and were almost equally disposed to seek out contacts. It is fruitful to carry the analysis further to see how the different patterns of contact and the different attitudes (sympathetic or unsympathetic) already observed are revealed in terms of perceptions of the other group.

### III. Perceptions of Others

#### 1. Ottawa as Seen by Members of Parliament

We have already noted in connection with the perception of the role of the M.P., and the description of the "good M.P.s"<sup>9</sup>, the extent to which M.P.s are inclined to feel that Members from other parties or provinces would differ in their perceptions from their own. In every case the majority of M.P.s thought that there would be no difference between their own and others' perceptions. We now examine the responses to a number of further questions designed to explore M.P.s' perceptions of others, particularly

---

<sup>9</sup>See above, Chapter ~~5174~~.



others of the language group different from the respondent's own.

We noted the tendency for French Canadian M.P.s not to spend more than the week days in Ottawa;<sup>10</sup> in sharp contrast to many English-speaking M.P.s (even Ontario M.P.s who may be taken as equally distant from Ottawa) Quebec M.P.s are far less inclined to live in Ottawa with their families during the parliamentary sessions. Does part of the answer lie in the attitude of French Canadians towards the city of Ottawa? In order to find out, but also to test different perceptions of the other group, we asked English-speaking and French-speaking Members:

42 (c) Is Ottawa the kind of place a French Canadian can feel at home in?

(d) Is Ottawa the kind of place an English Canadian can feel at home in?

The differences in replies between the two language groups are striking indeed: exactly half the French-speaking respondents stated that the French Canadian did not feel at home in Ottawa; but only 8.9% of the English-speaking M.P.s thought that French Canadians were not at home there.

Table 7.18

Replies of English-Speaking and French-Speaking  
M.P.s to Question of Whether or not French Canadians  
Feel at Home in Ottawa (horizontal %)

	<u>Feels at home</u>	<u>does not feel at home</u>	<u>DK</u>
English	70.9	8.9	20.3
French	38.9	50.0	11.1
N =	70	25	20

It is interesting to note that there are differences between the

---

<sup>10</sup>See above, Chapter Five.





French-speaking M.P.s in the different political parties: the majority of French-speaking Conservatives, French-speaking Social Crediters and Cr ditistes feel that the French Canadian is not at home in Ottawa; something less than a majority (41.7%) of the French-speaking Liberals agree.

There were also interesting differences on the basis of the location of the constituency, party and region. Rural M.P.s were most inclined to say that the French Canadian is at home in Ottawa; i.e. they were most inclined to disagree with the majority position of the French Canadians themselves. M.P.s from mixed urban/rural constituencies were somewhat less inclined to think French Canadians are at home in Ottawa, and urban M.P.s (a majority) were still less inclined to think they are at home. These differences were revealed in both major parties (and cannot therefore be put down simply to party differences, since the Conservatives are a predominantly rural party) although the differences were less distinct within the Liberal party: 90% of the rural Conservatives thought that French Canadians are at home in Ottawa; 66.7% of the rural Liberals agreed.

Table 7.19

M.P.s' Replies to Question of Whether or Not French Canadians Are at Home in Ottawa, by Urban/Rural Location of M.P.s' Constituency (horizontal %)				
	<u>feels at home</u>	<u>doesn't feel at home</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>N</u>
rural	76.9	15.4	7.7	39
urban/rural	60.5	23.7	15.8	38
urban	44.7	26.3	28.9	38



Some of the sharpness of the differences here is accounted for by the tendency of urban M.P.s to be uncertain as to whether or not the French Canadian is at home in Ottawa, but we can still note the clear difference between them and their rural colleagues who seem to be so certain that the French Canadian (contrary to his own indication of feeling) is at home in Ottawa.

Conservatives (79.4%) are most inclined to think that the French Canadian is at home in Ottawa; Liberals (56.7%) are less inclined to agree (true even when controlled for English Liberals only, although the differences between the two major parties is then not so great). N.D.P. Members (55.6%) are uncertain about how the French Canadian feels in Ottawa.

The regional differences are once more significant. The number of Quebec M.P.s thinking that the French Canadians are not at home in Ottawa (55.6%) is even higher than the number of French-speaking M.P.s thinking that French Canadians are not at home in Ottawa: that is, French-speaking Quebeckers are supported in their position here by English-speaking Quebeckers. British Columbia M.P.s offer the sharpest contrast with Quebec M.P.s in this respect: none stated that the French Canadian is not at home in Ottawa, although a considerable number are not sure. Most inclined to think that the French Canadian is at home in Ottawa are the Prairie M.P.s (88.9%), followed by the Maritime M.P.s (71.4%).



Table 7.20

M.P.s' Replies to Question of Whether or Not French Canadians

Are at Home in Ottawa, by Regions (horizontal %)

	<u>Feel at home</u>	<u>doesn't feel at home</u>	<u>DK</u>
B.C./Yukon	54.5	0.0	45.5
Prairies/N.W.T.	88.9	5.6	5.6
Ontario	66.7	8.3	25.0*
Quebec	38.9	55.6	5.6
Maritimes	71.4	7.1	21.4

\* The bulk of these were Liberals

We have here an excellent example of the way in which English Canadians see a situation in manner radically out of line with the perceptions of at least a majority of French Canadians. It also adds further weight to the British Columbia M.P.s' conviction that there is a problem of communication between English and French Canadians, and should cause many Prairie Conservatives to re-examine their belief that there is no problem of communication between English and French Canadians.

We also asked English and French-speaking M.P.s whether they thought that English Canadians feel at home in Ottawa. This time there was no difference in point of view between M.P.s of the two principal language groups, although it may be worth noting that French Canadians were a little more inclined to say that the English Canadian felt at home in Ottawa than English-speaking M.P.s themselves were prepared to say: 91.9% of the French-speaking M.P.s said that English Canadians feel at home in Ottawa; 82.5% of the English-speaking M.P.s agreed with them; only 15.0% of the English-speaking M.P.s said that English Canadians are not at home in Ottawa.





For most French-speaking M.P.s there was no doubt that English Canadians feel at home in Ottawa: why should they not feel at home? some of them asked, when the entire character of the city is English and therefore presumably acceptable to them. For the few English-speaking M.P.s who were not at home in Ottawa, however, the city was not English enough; one M.P. admitted that it would be difficult for anyone to feel at home in Ottawa, but a few other English-speaking M.P.s who do not like the city felt that there was now too much French influence in Ottawa for their liking.

Generally speaking, M.P.s of both language groups feel that Ottawa is a suitable national capital.<sup>11</sup> It is true that less than a majority (45.9%) of the French-speaking M.P.s were prepared to say that it is a suitable capital, compared with 63.6% of the English-speaking M.P.s who are satisfied with Ottawa as a national capital, but these differences are counterbalanced by nearly a third of the French-speaking M.P.s who feel that Ottawa can be a suitable capital with appropriate improvements. Only 21.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s and 14.3% of the English-speaking M.P.s feel that Ottawa is not (and apparently, cannot be) a suitable national capital.

There were no significant differences in the responses to the question of the suitability of Ottawa as a national capital when respondents were analysed by party or by the urban/rural location of their constituencies. Nor were the differences significant between the regions. The only point worth noting here is the preference of Prairie M.P.s for the national capital in its present location: 72.2% of the Prairie M.P.s regard Ottawa as a suitable national capital; only half the British Columbia M.P.s and just over

---

<sup>11</sup> The question asked of all M.P.s (the last one in Part A of the interview schedule) was: "Is it a suitable capital city for Canada?"



40% of the Quebec M.P.s think it is suitable at the moment.

What is it about Ottawa that made so many French-speaking M.P.s feel that French Canadians are not at home in the national capital? Fundamentally it was the absence of bilingualism in the daily life of the city. As one respondent put it: "S'il ne parle pas anglais, il se sent en pays étranger".<sup>12</sup> But the answer is also to be found in French-speaking respondents' adverse reaction to the coldness of the city, the noticeable lack of "la gaieté", good restaurants, and a cultural and artistic life. A number of French-speaking M.P.s, who are critical of Ottawa as it now is, see hope for it as a national capital provided certain improvements are made. The one solution mentioned by most M.P.s in this position was the idea of a bilingual federal district centred on Ottawa, but one M.P. suggested the idea of "une cité parlementaire". The case for change was pretty well summed up by this mild comment from a Quebec Liberal: "On commence à comprendre que le Canada est hétérogène et qu'il faut qu'Ottawa image ce plan social."

## 2. Self-Perceptions and the Perceptions of Others

In Part B of the questionnaire three fairly provocative statements were made, designed to test further for differences between the self-perception of a principal language group and the perception of it by the other principal language group.<sup>13</sup> One example of this kind was the statement:

---

<sup>12</sup>Another French-speaking respondent complained that "elle offre une face unilingue alors qu'elle devrait être la ville bilingue par excellence." But yet another respondent noted: "on peut parler Français; on le parle plus qu' à Montreal (ouest)."

<sup>13</sup>We have already noted the responses to one of these statements in Chapter Four above.



"The main concern of the English Canadian M.P.s is not to rock the party boat". The quotation had come from one French-speaking Liberal M.P. in the course of the preliminary interviews during the summer of 1964. We were particularly interested to see whether there were other French Canadians with this view of the English-speaking M.P. and also whether English Canadians would agree with this particular characterisation of themselves.

The short answer to the second question is that the vast majority do not agree: 78.1% of the English-speaking M.P.s said that they disagreed with the statement and only 20.5% said they agreed. On the other hand, the results show that our earlier French-speaking respondent was not alone in his view of English-speaking M.P.s: 42.4% of his French-speaking colleagues agreed with the statement and a further 24.2% were not sure; only 33.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s disagreed with the statement. But the responses are more meaningful when looked at from the point of view of party. The bulk of the French-speaking Members were from the Opposition parties: not one French-speaking Conservative, Cr ditiste or Social Credit Party member disagreed with the statement. All of the French-speaking disagreement with the proposition came from the French-speaking Liberals, 52.4% of whom disagree with it, with a further 28.6% not sure.

Probably because the Liberal M.P.s are the most sensitive to the charge of disciplined voting in the House of Commons, they reacted most against the suggestion of being unwilling to "rock the party boat": in any case the English-speaking Liberals (83.3%) were the most disposed of English-speaking M.P.s to disagree with the statement, and the French-speaking Liberals were the most disposed of French-speaking M.P.s to agree with them.

Another statement allowed us to compare reactions to the suggestion that: "English Canadian M.P.s enjoy more freedom from their party





organizations than French Canadian M.P.s". In this case there are no significant differences overall between M.P.s of the two principal language groups. Only about 14% of the M.P.s in our sample agree with the suggestion, and there are no differences whatever in the proportions from each of the two language groups. What is most interesting is the very large number of M.P.s, particularly English-speaking Liberals, who are not sure: 55.9% of the French-speaking M.P.s disagreed with the proposition and 42.9% of the English-speaking M.P.s disagreed; but more than 40% of the English-speaking M.P.s and just under 30% of the French-speaking M.P.s were not sure.

There are no overall differences in the responses when examined from the point of view of urban/rural location of constituency, region or party, but when English-speaking Conservatives are compared with English-speaking Liberals, and when the latter are compared in turn with French-speaking Liberals, some interesting points emerge. Whereas English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives are equally inclined to agree with the proposition that English-speaking M.P.s are freer of their party organizations than French-speaking M.P.s, English-speaking Liberals are far less inclined than Conservatives to disagree with the statement: 60% of the Conservatives disagree with the suggestion, but only 29.4% of the Liberals disagree; the difference is made up by the very large number of English-speaking Liberals (55.9% as compared with 28% of the Conservatives) who are not sure. Ontario Liberals, who were the only English-speaking Liberals to agree with the statement, make up one half of the small number of English-speaking M.P.s who agree that English-speaking M.P.s are freer. Ontario Liberals also represent 46.2% of the total number of M.P.s who are not sure. Contrast their position with that of French-speaking Liberals: only one



French-speaking Liberal agrees with the statement, 63.6% disagree and 31.8% are not sure.

Table 7.21

Replies of English-Speaking and French-Speaking  
Liberals to the Proposition that "English  
Canadian M.P.s Enjoy More Freedom From Their  
Constituency Organizations Than French Canadian  
M.P.s" (horizontal %)

	<u>agree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>not sure</u>
English	14.7	29.4	55.9
French	4.5	63.6	31.8
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	6	24	26

The difference on the question of whether or not English Canadian M.P.s enjoy more freedom from their party organizations than French Canadian M.P.s is greater between English and French-speaking Members of the Liberal Party than it is between the two language groups overall: English-speaking Liberals are far less inclined than their French-speaking cohorts to disagree with the suggestion. This is not the first time, nor will it be the last, that we have encountered clear differences in perception between the English-speaking and French-speaking Members of the same political party.

### 3. Specific Roles of Language Groups

Another question of particular interest was intended to reveal whether English-speaking M.P.s and French-speaking M.P.s think that they have specific roles to perform within the House of Commons, or within



their parties, as members of a language group. English-speaking M.P.s were asked: "Do you think that the French Canadian M.P., as a French Canadian, should play a specific role in the House of Commons and in his party?" "What role should he play?" "Does he succeed in practice in playing such a role?" The same questions were then asked of the English-speaking respondents with regard to a specific role for English Canadians. Comparable questions were also asked of French Canadian M.P.s. We could then compare self-perceptions of role with those attributed by members of the other principal language group.

The differences in perception between M.P.s of the two principal language groups are as clear here as anywhere in the entire study:

nearly 80% of the French-speaking M.P.s feel that they have a specific role to perform as French Canadians; less than 40% of the English-speaking M.P.s are inclined to agree with them. M.P.s of the two groups also differ in their perception of a specific role for English-speaking Canadians: fewer than one-fifth of the English-speaking M.P.s feel that they have a specific role, whereas more than half the French-speaking M.P.s see a specific role for English Canadians. The majority of both principal language groups take a consistent position: the majority of French-speaking respondents see a specific role for themselves and English-speaking M.P.s; the majority of English-speaking M.P.s see no specific role for themselves or French Canadians.<sup>13b</sup> It matters less, however, that French-speaking M.P.s are inclined to attribute a role which English-speaking M.P.s are not

---

<sup>13b</sup> Only one English-speaking M.P. attributed a specific role to himself while denying a specific role to French Canadian M.P.s. Nine French-speaking members denied a specific role to English Canadians while attributing a specific role to themselves.





particularly inclined to feel they ought to have than that so many French-speaking M.P.s should feel that they have a specific role to play, and so many English-speaking M.P.s should feel that they do not.

Table 7.22

English-Speaking and French-Speaking Respondents  
Mentioning Specific Role in House of Commons or  
Party for English Canadian and French Canadian

	M.P.s	
	% attributing specific role to English Canadian M.P.	% attributing specific role to French Canadian M.P. (%)
English	18.8	39.8
French	51.4	79.2

When M.P.s' perceptions of the specific role of English-speaking M.P.s are looked at from the point of other variables, the language differences of respondents remains the only really significant influence. There were no significant differences resulting from the urban/rural location of the M.P.s' constituencies; apart from the fact that the Cr ditistes (all French-speaking) were most inclined to mention a specific role for English Canadian M.P.s, there were no significant differences between the parties; and regional differences also merely reflected the language differences already noted.

The main point to emerge with regard to M.P.s' perception of a specific role for French-speaking M.P.s was the sharp difference in outlook between English and French-speaking M.P.s, the latter being far more inclined to see a specific role for themselves than the English-speaking M.P.s were prepared to attribute to them. In contrast, however, to the



situation which we just observed with regard to the perception of a specific role for English-speaking M.P.s, there are differences as between the regions in the perception of a specific role for French Canadians. We are not referring simply to the differences between Quebec and the rest: such differences would naturally be expected to show up when so many French-speaking M.P.s take a position different from English-speaking M.P.s; rather, there are notable differences between the English-speaking regions as well. M.P.s from British Columbia are the least inclined to attribute a specific role to French Canadian M.P.s; Prairie M.P.s are next least inclined; and Ontario M.P.s (45% of them) are the most inclined to attribute a specific role to French Canadian M.P.s.

Table 7.23

Percentage of Respondents Denying Specific Role to French

Canadian M.P.s, by Regions

B.C./Yukon	81.8
Prairies/N.W.T.	66.7
Ontario	55.0
Quebec	10.9
Maritimes	62.5

There are no significant differences between the parties that are not accounted for in terms of language differences: 59% of the English-speaking Liberals, 55.6% of the English-speaking Conservatives and 55.6% of the N.D.P. stated that French Canadian M.P.s, as French Canadians, should not have a specific role within the House of Commons and within their parties.



We have here, in the question of differing role perceptions, one of the best examples of clear differences in outlook between M.P.s from the two principal language groups in Canada. That these differences are indeed sharp is revealed by the following contrast between the views of English-speaking Liberals and French-speaking Liberals.

Table 7.24

English-Speaking and French-Speaking Liberals Denying

A Specific Role to English Canadian and

French Canadian M.P.s

	<u>% denying specific role to English Canadian M.P.s</u>	<u>% denying a specific role to French Canadian M.P.s</u>
English	71.8	59.0
French	52.0	25.0

It can be seen from these figures, compared with those in Table 7.23, that the proximity of the two language groups within the same political party cannot be said to have had much effect of making their perceptions of themselves or others any different from those of M.P.s who are not able to receive the same kind of contact within the same party. The only effect which might be mentioned, not much in itself, is the fact that French-speaking Liberals were a little more inclined than French-speaking M.P.s in general to say that they have no specific role as French Canadians: 7 of the 8 French-speaking M.P.s who denied that there was a specific role for them as French Canadians were Liberals.<sup>13c</sup> We might

---

<sup>13c</sup> These same French-speaking Liberals also denied a specific role to English Canadians.





also note that those English Canadians who stated that there was no problem of communication between English and French-speaking were the most inclined to deny a specific role to French Canadians, a role which the majority of them clearly arrogate to themselves.

What roles, in particular, did M.P.s attribute to themselves and to others? One point, on which many English-speaking M.P.s were in agreement with French-speaking M.P.s, was on the role of the French-speaking M.P. as a representative of his language group's special needs in the federal sphere: the vast majority of English-speaking M.P.s who were prepared to grant a specific role to French-speaking M.P.s (84% of those mentioning a role) referred to a role of this kind. Among other roles mentioned by English-speaking M.P.s as appropriate to French-speaking M.P.s were those of "interpreting Canada to their constituents", "speaking out against Quebec from time to time in the long run interests of Canada and "preserving the cultural differences".

French-speaking M.P.s also inclined to the role of representative of his cultural group's special needs in the federal sphere (63% of the French-speaking respondents mentioning a role pointed to this one) but they were also inclined to mention a further role: protection of the constitutional rights of French Canadians, which English-speaking respondents all but ignored. 51.7% of the French-speaking respondents mentioning a role for French Canadian M.P.s singled out "protection of the constitutional rights of French Canadians"; only 4 English-speaking M.P.s mentioned the role. A few French-speaking respondents mentioned other roles: to neutralize English-speaking influences, to make French Canadians better known to the rest of the country, and "d'mener le gouvernement



fédéral à se considérer comme le gouvernement de tous les Canadiens".

Not many English-speaking M.P.s had in mind a specific role for themselves, but those who did seemed to favour no particular role (or roles) as did the French-speaking M.P.s. A few thought they had a role "to make for a stronger Canada" and to "keep the nation together"; another felt that English Canadians had a role in explaining "Quebec's peculiar differences, but looking for compromises"; still another noted the need for an English-speaking M.P. in a constituency close to Quebec to accent his role as a spokesman for English Canadians in order to be re-elected. French-speaking respondents mentioned roles for English Canadians that were in many ways like their self-ascribed roles: several mentioned the role of "défendeur des intérêts de la partie anglaise", three mentioned the task of staying Canadian and not American; others mentioned the job of explaining bilingualism to English Canada, carrying on a dialogue, and understanding the French Canadian point of view. Two English-speaking M.P.s and one French-speaking M.P. agreed that the role of the English Canadian M.P. was "to become bilingual and try to understand French Canadian wishes."

Do M.P.s succeed in practice in playing the roles which M.P.s think they should play? There were so few English-speaking M.P.s who thought that they had a specific role to play that the significance of the answers to the question of their success in playing the selected role must be taken lightly: only 3 English-speaking M.P.s judged that they were successful; 7 said that sometimes they were successful, sometimes not, and 6 thought that they were not successful.

A bare majority of French Canadian M.P.s, on the other hand, thought that English-speaking M.P.s had a specific role to play, and the majority



of these thought that the English Canadian was successful in his role-playing. Seventeen of the 19 French-speaking M.P.s who thought the English-speaking M.P.s had a role commented on the degree of their success: nine thought they were successful; six thought that they were sometimes successful, sometimes not, and only two thought that they were unsuccessful. By and large then, in the eyes of the French-speaking M.P.s, a great many English-speaking M.P.s are successful in performing a role specifically as an English-speaking M.P., a role which the vast majority of English-speaking M.P.s do not choose to recognize for themselves.

What of the success of French Canadians in playing the role which they chose for themselves? Interestingly enough, there are no significant differences between the estimates of the M.P.s from the two principal language groups on this matter. English-speaking M.P.s were far less inclined to think that the French-speaking M.P. has a role to play, but those who did see such a role were as disposed as French Canadians to think that the French-speaking M.P. is successful. Only 11.5% of the French-speaking M.P.s and 20% of the English-speaking M.P.s think that French-speaking M.P.s are unsuccessful in their role.

Table 7.25

French-Speaking and English-Speaking Respondents'			
Estimates of Success of French-Speaking M.P.s in			
Playing a Specific Role Within the House of Commons			
And/Or Their Party (horizontal %)			
	successful	sometimes successful sometimes not	unsuccessful
English	40.0	40.1	20.0
French	42.3	46.3	11.5
N =	21	22	8





There are no differences in these perceptions between M.P.s on the basis of urban/rural location of their constituencies; there are no significant regional variations; but there were rather significant differences between the parties. Although there were no significant differences on the basis of language, an obvious source of possible difference between Liberals and Conservatives, the latter were far more inclined than any other party to say that French Canadians are unsuccessful in playing their role. Conservatives are not less inclined than others to think that French-speaking M.P.s have a specific role, but many of them think that if the French Canadian plays a specific role he is not successful at it. 54.5% of the Conservatives who commented on the success of French-speaking M.P.s' role-playing, said that they were not successful; only one Liberal (French-speaking) thought that they were not successful. All the N.D.P. members with views on the subject thought that the French-speaking M.P.s were successful.

Table 7.26

Liberal, Conservative and N.D.P. Estimates of the  
Degree of Success of French-Speaking M.P.s in  
Playing a Specific Role Within the House of  
Commons or Their Parties (horizontal %)

	<u>successful</u>	<u>sometimes successful, sometimes not</u>	<u>unsuccessful</u>
Liberals	53.6	42.9	3.6
Conservatives	9.1	36.4	54.5
New Democrats	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
N =	20	16	7



Perhaps the most interesting thing to emerge from this analysis is the fact that despite the unwillingness of the vast majority of English-speaking M.P.s to countenance the notion of French Canadian M.P.s having a specific role as French Canadians in the House of Commons and in their parties, most French-speaking M.P.s feel that they are successful at least some of the time in playing the specific role they have created for themselves. Moreover only the Conservatives, among the English M.P.s who see a specific role for French Canadians, disagree with them.

To press our analysis of the perceptions of others a little further we asked all M.P.s the following question:

- 34 (a) Are there, in your opinion, many occasions on which a French Canadian feels ill-at-ease and frustrated when seeking to participate in federal politics?

A majority of both English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s agree that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease in federal politics: French-speaking M.P.s are more inclined to agree than English-speaking M.P.s; but 11.0% of the English M.P.s said that they did not know. The difference between those in both language groups thinking that French Canadians are not ill-at-ease and frustrated is negligible.

Table 7.27

English-Speaking and French-Speaking M.P.s' Opinion  
On Whether or Not French Canadians Are Ill-At-Ease in

		Federal Politics (horizontal %)		
		Are not ill-at- ease	are ill-at- ease	DK
English		37.8	51.2	11.0
French		29.7	67.6	2.7
N =		42	67	10



Once again there are no significant differences in the responses to this question between M.P.s from rural and urban constituencies. However, there are some interesting differences between the parties, and especially within the parties. N.D.P. Members (44%) are most inclined to say that they do not know whether or not French Canadians are frustrated in federal politics. Cr ditistes are most inclined to say that French Canadians are not ill-at-ease (the group divided 50-50 on this question). There are no differences whatever between the English-speaking members of the Liberal and Conservative parties.

The bulk of the difference between English and French-speaking respondents, which was noted above, is accounted for by the considerable disposition of French-speaking Liberals to say that they feel ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics. Seventy-two per cent of the French-speaking Liberals answered "yes" to the question; only 24% said "no", and one said that he did not know. English-speaking Liberals were no more inclined than English-speaking Conservatives to recognize this apparent frustration.

Table 7.28

English-Speaking and French-Speaking Liberals' Opinion  
on Whether or Not French Canadians are Ill-At-Ease  
And Frustrated in Federal Politics (horizontal %)

	<u>are not ill-at-ease</u>	<u>are ill-at-ease</u>	<u>DK</u>
English	37.8*	54.1	8.1
French	24.0	72.0	4.0

\*The comparable figure for English-speaking Conservatives was 38.2%.





Once more there are interesting regional variations. Even though Conservatives were generally no different from Liberals (especially English-speaking Liberals) in their disposition to recognize frustration on the part of French Canadians at the level of federal politics, Prairie Conservatives and M.P.s from British Columbia were less willing to agree. The differences in this case are not much, and should not be exaggerated; but they fit the pattern that has already emerged: Ontario and Maritime M.P.s (who, we noticed, are most sympathetic to French Canadians) are most nearly comparable to Quebec M.P.s in their estimation of whether or not French Canadians are ill-at-ease: a majority in each case agrees that they are. British Columbia and Prairie M.P.s (who are, as we have seen, somewhat less sympathetic) on the other hand are least inclined to recognize that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease.

Table 7.29

M.P.s' Opinion on Whether French Canadian M.P.s  
Are Ill-At-Ease and Frustrated in Federal Politics,  
by Regions (horizontal %)

	<u>is not ill-at-ease</u>	<u>is ill-at-ease</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>N</u>
B.C./Yukon	36.4	45.5	18.2	11
Prairies	57.9	31.6	10.5	19
Ontario	29.7	59.5*	10.8	37
Quebec	30.6	69.4	0.0	36
Maritimes	31.3	56.3	12.5	16

\* Conservatives were more inclined than Liberals to say that French Canadians are ill-at-ease.

The most important point to emphasize here is not the differences



in perception apparent between regions or even between language groups, but the agreement that exists on the part of all Members (but especially among French-speaking Liberals) that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics. Had French Canadians been a good deal more inclined to say that they are unsuccessful in playing the roles as French Canadians which they wish to play within the House of Commons and within their parties, evidence of a considerable measure of frustration might have been expected. But we have noted that most French-speaking M.P.s, and the majority of the English-speaking M.P.s who recognize such a role, believe that the French Canadian M.P. is successful in performing his role. Wherein lies the source of his frustration then? It might be suggested that it is in part derived from the fact of so much hostility on the part of English-speaking M.P.s to the idea of his playing a specific role at all: even if the French Canadian M.P. feels that he is successful in playing his role, it may be frustrating to know that so many English-speaking M.P.s reject the role he has chosen for himself. The answer may, in part, also lie in the differences in roles which are attributed even by those English-speaking M.P.s who are inclined to see a specific role for French Canadians. It may be recalled here that only a very few English-speaking M.P.s mentioned the role of "protector of the constitutional rights of French Canadians" which nearly two-thirds of French Canadians selected for themselves. But these suggestions do not add up to a satisfactory answer. We would still want to ask why French-speaking Liberals appear more frustrated than Cr ditistes. We would want to know whether the frustration of which the M.P.s complain is of a similar nature or whether it seems to be related to the individual M.P.'s general orientation to the political process at Ottawa.



These are questions which we will try to answer in a later chapter when we focus on the differences between those French-speaking M.P.s who feel that the French Canadian is frustrated and those who do not. We will then look at the examples given by both English and French-speaking M.P.s of the occasions on which frustration is apparent.

#### IV. Summary

We have seen several examples in this chapter of the way in which clear differences emerge in the perceptions of one language group as compared to the other. Sometimes, when overall differences on the basis of language orientation are not apparent, differences among our respondents were revealed in terms of region, party or even (rarely) location of the constituency. In general, however, the M.P.'s language group is the most consistent indicator of differences in attitude.

Much of the evidence suggests that there has been a general tendency to underestimate the problem of communication between English and French-speaking M.P.s, but there is also evidence to suggest that even when the problem is recognized, even when M.P.s are sympathetic towards the M.P.s of other language groups, or when communication between the two principal language groups is facilitated (as it is within the Liberal party) there is no certainty that M.P.s of two language groups will appreciate in any substantial way the perceptions of the other.

One further curious fact regarding the problem of communication between English and French Canadians remains to be taken into account. In order to check whether the "crisis" in the survey and the publicity it received<sup>14</sup> had any material effect on the answers of respondents, we

---

<sup>14</sup>See Chapter Three.





analyzed a number of responses to compare the opinions of those interviewed before and after the crisis. In only one case was there any significant difference. Even in the answers to the controversial statement, "Politics is a dirty game", there is no significant difference in the responses. However, there is a difference in the disposition of respondents to recognize a problem of communication between English and French-speaking M.P.s. Despite the fact that the two groups of respondents are for all intents and purposes the same in terms of number, party and region, respondents after the crisis were considerably more inclined to say that there is no problem of communication: only 17.5% of those interviewed before the crisis thought there was no problem, but 44.6% of those interviewed after the crisis thought there is no problem. Whether or not this difference can be accounted for by an attempt of post-crisis respondents to suggest the lack of any need for a study of the House of Commons by asserting that no problem of communication exists, we cannot say. Suffice it to note that they were unsuccessful in disguising the existence of a serious problem of communication between the two principal language groups!



## CHAPTER EIGHT

### BILINGUALISM IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### 1. The Translation System

We have already noticed the considerable increase in the use of the French language in debates in the House of Commons during the last decade. Only a small proportion of the total time taken up in French language debate can be accounted for by English Canadians using the language of the other principal group, but it may be taken as an indication of the growing political and economic importance of the French Canadian presence in Canada that English-speaking M.P.s used the language at all. That the use of French in debates within the House of Commons was on the increase before the introduction of simultaneous translation facilities suggests that French language debate would likely have emerged as a more prominent feature of House of Commons proceedings in any case, but it cannot be denied that the existence of simultaneous translation facilities has greatly encouraged the growth. How do M.P.s of both language groups react to this new development? What problems, if any, do they think are created as a result of the bilingual character of the House's membership? How does bilingualism work at the committee, general caucus and provincial (or regional) caucus level? Would M.P.s want to see



substantive extensions of the bilingual character of federal politics? These are very important questions, to which the responses of M.P.s interviewed in this survey may be expected to offer some answers.

M.P.s from both language groups were asked: "What, in your opinion, is the effect of bilingualism upon the operations of Parliament?". Interviewers were instructed to probe for mention of problems at the committee and caucus level and elsewhere, for example in the parliamentary library. For 42.5% of the English-speaking M.P.s and 47.2% of the French-speaking M.P.s bilingualism had no special effect; that is to say, apart from the obvious effect of making it easier for members of the two language groups to speak their own language, nothing was singled out for mention. Typical of this kind of reply was the following made by a Prairie Conservative:

Prior to 1958 it was very difficult for an English-speaking M.P. who did not speak French to get a true picture of a day's proceedings. Since simultaneous translation has been installed the House of Commons is a beautiful thing to see. I like to see the two languages used extensively; then everybody knows what is going on. I don't agree with some who say that it delays the House; it's a silly view.

A Quebec Liberal commented in a similar vein:

Ce n'est que depuis dix ans seulement que les députés canadiens-français s'expriment en Français. Aujourd'hui, c'est un procédé admis et tout à fait normal; ça n'affecte pas le système, ça ne ralentit pas les travaux.

Another Quebec Liberal believed that, since the formation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the status of bilingualism within the House of Commons had undergone "une grosse amélioration", but he noted also that the situation was still far from perfect: "On n'aura pas la perfection tout qu'on n'aura pas un système d'éducation





fédéral bilingue."

Not all the English-speaking M.P.s thought that bilingualism in action in the House of Commons was "a beautiful thing to see". But few were as extreme in their comments as this British Columbia Liberal:

Bilingualism slows down procedure. Too much emphasis is being placed on bilingualism; it's getting to the point where it is more important to speak two languages than it is to express profound wisdom. We have simultaneous translation in most of the committees. Most French can speak and understand English pretty well. All this simultaneous translation is a courtesy which may not be entirely necessary.

The most important single effect of bilingualism for English-speaking M.P.s was the delay which it is said to bring about in the operations of Parliament, particularly at the committee level. 63.9% of the English-speaking M.P.s who mentioned an effect of bilingualism spoke of delays: in the proceedings of the House of Commons as a result of repetition; or in committees as a result of French-speaking M.P.s' insistence on translators or bilingual stenographers; or in general as a result of the delay in the publication of English language reports and documents in order to attempt to provide the two language versions simultaneously. Considering the fact that many of our interviews took place at a time when the delay of the debate on the Canada Pensions Bill, because of the unavailability of a French version of the committee proceedings, was at the forefront of many Members' minds, it is perhaps not surprising that this effect was given such prominent attention. Indeed, 36.9% of the French-speaking M.P.s who mentioned an effect of bilingualism pointed to delays of this kind as well.

For French-speaking M.P.s, however, the most important single effect of bilingualism was the problem it creates at the committee level;



57.9% of the French-speaking M.P.s who saw some effect of bilingualism mentioned the difficulties that are created for them by the lack of simultaneous translation facilities for committees in which the bulk of the work seems to be conducted in English. More precisely put, perhaps, the problem for many French Canadians at the committee level is not bilingualism, but unilingualism. With regard to the committees one Quebec Liberal complained:

Il est malheureux qu' à 80% des sessions publiques tous les rapports sont fournis en Anglais. Même nos canadiens-français s'expriment en Anglais, par exemple sur le rapport annuel de la C.T.C., Jodoin parle en Anglais.

Few French Canadians were as pointed in their discussion of the effects of this one-sided use of language in committees as this Quebec Liberal, but his point of view might well be taken as indicative of several others:

En comité, à cause du manque de tradacteurs, ça exemplifie chez nous le sentiment minoritaire; en tant que minoritaires, on pense que l'on fait perdre du temps aux autres, et résultat: complexe d'infériorité.

We have already noted above, with regard to the poorer participation of French Canadians on committees, one of the possible consequences of a feeling of inferiority.<sup>1</sup>

The problem of bilingualism at the committee level was also,

---

<sup>1</sup> One English-speaking Conservative noted that in his experience French Canadians often withdraw from committees because they cannot follow the discussion. Another English-speaking M.P., a Liberal, commenting on the question of whether bilingualism causes any difficulties in committee said: "On the committees I'm on there is no problem: the French are either bilingual or do not attend, so we don't have to worry about it."



as we have noticed, mentioned by a number of English-speaking M.P.s. For them, however, the problem was the delay that may occur when French-speaking M.P.s insist on obtaining a translator or stenographer for the committee proceedings even if they can (as some English-speaking M.P.s complained) understand English well enough. (That it might be an exhausting effort for even a fairly bilingual French Canadian member to have to deal exclusively in English was not mentioned by one English Canadian M.P.) Whatever the cause of the irritation at the committee level, M.P.s of both language groups see a problem and, in response to a later question asking them to evaluate the translation system in the House of Commons, about 30% of each language group complained of the shortages of translators for committees.

English-speaking M.P.s were somewhat more inclined to mention more than one effect of bilingualism, revealing a tendency to mention the additional cost of a bilingual system, along with the delays which it is said to cause. A few M.P.s were given to sweeping commentaries on the effect of bilingualism: one English-speaking M.P. and one French-speaking M.P. pointed to the general inconvenience and confusion resulting from the use of two languages, but both thought it a "necessary evil"; two English-speaking M.P.s said that bilingualism "affects their work adversely"; another claimed that it creates disunity. Two English-speaking M.P.s and one French-speaking M.P. seemed more concerned that the need to have things translated caused the speaker's real meaning and feelings to be missed. It is interesting to note, finally, that hardly any M.P.s regretted that a simultaneous translation system for the bilingual House had the effect





Table 8.1

Effects of Bilingualism on the Operations of  
Parliament Mentioned by English-speaking and  
French-speaking M.P.s\*

	<u>% English M.P.s mentioning</u>	<u>% French M.P.s mentioning</u>
causes delays	63.9	36.9
expensive	23.3	10.5
causes problems at committee level	48.9	57.9
causes problems at caucus level	6.3	15.8
other effects	<u>21.2</u>	<u>15.8</u>
Total	163.6**	136.9**

\* these results are given in terms of the percentage of those mentioning an effect of bilingualism and not in terms of the entire sample, nearly half of whom thought there was no special effect.

\*\* because several M.P.s mentioned more than one effect the total is greater than 100%.

of destroying effectively the necessity to learn both languages.<sup>2</sup> Such a view had been expressed in debate in the House of Commons in 1959<sup>3</sup>, but

---

<sup>2</sup> We might also note that our probing about problems of bilingualism in the library turned up only two critical comments: one M.P. complained that there are not enough French books in the library and another felt that the library's documentation in French is poor.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the remarks of M. Ormiston and M. Godin, Canada, Official Report of Debates, House of Commons, (French edition), 1959, Vol. 1, p. 121 and Vol. III, p. 2987.



only two backbenchers and one frontbencher interviewed expressed similar feelings in 1965. Two English-speaking M.P.s actually find that the simultaneous translation system assists their learning of the French language.

When M.P.s' responses on the question of the effect of bilingualism on the operations of Parliament are examined from the point of view of the urban or rural location of constituencies no significant differences are revealed; nor are there any significant differences between the parties.<sup>3b</sup> Even the regional variations in this case are not very great; but one or two features are worth comment. M.P.s from British Columbia and the Maritimes were rather less inclined than M.P.s from the other regions to say that there was no effect from the bilingual phenomenon in Parliament. Those British Columbia M.P.s who noted effects pointed equally to delays and problems at the committee level, but Maritime M.P.s (56.3% of the total group) were much more disposed than any other region's M.P.s to mention the delay which bilingualism is said to cause in the operations of Parliament. The expense of the system was not very important for the vast majority of M.P.s, with respondents from the Prairies and Ontario accounting for most of the references to this particular effect.

We mentioned earlier that M.P.s were also asked whether they found "the present translation service fully satisfactory". We did not distinguish in the question between the written translation and the simultaneous interpretation in the House and committees; answers, therefore, were

---

<sup>3b</sup> Within the Liberal party the younger M.P.s (under 34) were least inclined to say that bilingualism had no effect; 44.9% specifically mentioned problems at the committee level.



received on both matters.

English-speaking M.P.s were more inclined than French-speaking M.P.s to say that the translation service was fully satisfactory. Typical of the replies of nearly half of the English-speaking M.P.s was the following by a British Columbia Liberal: "I think I get the gist of what they're saying; I have no complaints about it though I would have to be completely bilingual to judge the accuracy of the written translation. I have been on committees where there are some difficulties getting translators, but that doesn't impede my participation." French-speaking M.P.s were not quite so satisfied: 38% of them complained about the delay in written translations, whereas only 15.3% of the English-speaking M.P.s mentioned the problem. Taken along with their criticism of the shortage of interpreters for committees, this amounts to a fairly substantial complaint on the part of French-speaking M.P.s over the status of their language in the House of Commons.

Table 8.2

Evaluation of the Translation System by

English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s (horizontal %)  
(total % more than 100% because of plural mentions)

	<u>satisfactory in all respects</u>	<u>poor inter- pretation</u>	<u>shortage of inter- preters for Commons unsatisfactory</u>	<u>delay in written translation un- satisfactory</u>
English	49.4	10.6	28.2	15.3
French	<u>27.0</u>	<u>16.3</u>	<u>29.9</u>	<u>38.0</u>
N =	52	15	35	27

Although about 12% of the M.P.s complained of the quality of the





simultaneous interpretation, there were hardly any complaints about the quality of the sound system as such. One M.P. mentioned the occasional difficulty of adjusting to the switching back and forth from a male voice to a female voice over the translation system, and another pointed to the problem of hearing the translation when sitting close to the speaker, but these were relatively minor and rare criticisms. Most of those who criticised the quality of the interpretation recognized the difficulties of rendering ideas into another language; one M.P. thought that the translation facilities of NATO were no better; another thought that, although a better staff was needed, our system was "vastly improved and improving". "Our facilities", the same M.P. thought, "are not as good as those in the United Nations", however, and for him this was a matter of regret: "this is where we should do bilingualism better than anywhere else in the world." But few were as critical of the service as one Quebec Liberal who was dissatisfied with the system "parce qu'il y a certains tradacteurs incompetents: on devrait faire un choix plus rigide des tradacteurs; il leur faut une culture plus approfondie afin de traduire la pensée."

Over all a little more than 40% of the M.P.s thought that the translation system was fully satisfactory. Opinions differed between the parties on this matter, but by and large they followed what would be expected from the fundamental difference between English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s on the question. At first glance it appeared that Conservatives are considerably more satisfied with the translation system than the Liberals; but when we looked at the differences between English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives, the differences were much less sharply revealed.



The differences between the regions on this question are interesting, and offer a parallel with the regional variations on the question dealing with the effect of the bilingual system on the operations of Parliament. It may be recalled that M.P.s from British Columbia and the Maritimes, compared with M.P.s from the three other regions, were most inclined to mention some effect of bilingualism on the operations of Parliament, particularly delays and problems at the committee level. M.P.s from British Columbia and the Maritimes (particularly the Conservatives from the Maritimes) were also most disposed to say that they had no complaints with the translation system. As might be expected, Quebec M.P.s were most critical of the translation system, but they were only a little more critical of it than M.P.s from Ontario. We were not able to prove the point from our data, but it may be the difference between Ontario and the other English-speaking provinces in this regard is largely accounted for by the opinions of French-speaking Ontario M.P.s.

Table 8.3

Opinions on the Effect of Bilingualism on the Operations  
of Parliament, and M.P.s' Evaluation of the  
Translation System, by Regions

	<u>% saying bilingualism has no effect</u>	<u>% saying translation system fully satisfactory</u>
B.C./Yukon	27.3	63.6
Prairies	52.6	57.9
Ontario	50.0	37.3
Quebec	42.9	27.8
Maritimes	31.3	56.2



Since formal responsibility for the operations of a bilingual House of Commons rests with the Speaker, it might be worthwhile in passing to look at M.P.s' responses to the question: "What part does the Speaker play in operating the bilingual system?" Probably the most significant result is that 27.3% of the English-speaking M.P.s and 10.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s think that he plays no part at all. Of those who thought that the Speaker has a role to perform, the majority mentioned his function of speaking in both languages, thus giving formal recognition to the two official languages. Six M.P.s (five of them English-speaking) felt that the Speaker helps understanding between the two language groups.

Table 8.4

French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s' Opinions  
of Part Played by the Speaker in the Operations of  
the Bilingual System (horizontal %)

	no part	supervises administration of bilingual system	formal recog- nition of two languages	other
English	27.3	22.1	37.7	13.0*
French	10.3	17.2	51.7	20.7**
N =	24	22	44	16

\* half said that he helps understanding between the two language groups.

\*\* almost exclusively mentioned combination of supervising administration of system and giving formal recognition to the two language groups.

Another reason for asking this question, especially in the rather vague manner in which it was put, was to draw out Members to make any





comments they felt like making about the Speaker and his role in the House of Commons. For a few it was an opportunity to say that in their opinion Speaker MacNaughton had been far too lenient with French Canadians. For others it was an opportunity to say that the former Speaker was not really sufficiently bilingual to do the job properly. Although the criticism was limited to a few, a number of M.P.s mentioned their belief that the then Deputy Speaker, Mr. Lamoureux, was very good at the job. Not every Member by any means went out of his way to stress the point, but a considerable number of English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s insisted that the Speaker must be bilingual; French-speaking respondents tended, moreover, to add perfectly bilingual.

## 11. The Use of French by Ministers

Since the introduction of simultaneous translation, most French-speaking Members can and do speak in their mother tongue in debates on a far wider range of subjects, and more frequently than ever before, with greater attention from their English-speaking colleagues. There are several English-speaking Members, of course, who complain about the expense and/or delay that comes from the fact of a bilingual system, and a few of these hope for the day (preferably soon) when the problem will be solved by the disappearance of the French language within the House altogether. "The inevitable superiority of English as the universal language of economic development and communication", as one respondent put it, will apparently see to that. For the rest, however, there seems to be agreement that, despite criticisms, the bilingual parliamentary system will and must be retained.

But how willing are English-speaking M.P.s, in particular, to see



further concrete extensions of the system? How do they react, for example, to the suggestion that "It would be better if French-speaking Ministers always spoke in French; they would express themselves more satisfactorily." The notion is not a wild one, by any means: it could be argued that it would be the logical result of the full implications of the reasserted status of the French language within Parliament; in any case it would undoubtedly make the lot of a few French-speaking Ministers easier, ministers who, whether they will admit it or not, get themselves into occasional difficulties in replying, especially to questions in the House, in the English tongue.<sup>4</sup> How do the M.P.s, particularly the English-speaking M.P.s, react?

Once more English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s differ sharply in outlook: 85.3% of the latter agree with the proposition; only 38.6% of the English-speaking M.P.s agree. When we take into account the fact that some of the refusals, whose views are therefore excluded from these results, can reasonably be assumed not to be favourably disposed towards the extension of bilingualism and biculturalism, we may safely conclude that, at least, our results do not exaggerate the opposition on the part of English-speaking M.P.s to the suggestion.<sup>4b</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> This suggestion was made by one M.P. in the course of the preliminary interviews.

<sup>4b</sup> It is important to note, however, that English-speaking M.P.s who are unsympathetic towards French Canadians were found to be no more opposed to the idea than the sympathetic ones.



Table 8.5

English and French-speaking M.P.s' Opinion on the  
Suggestion that "It Would be Better if French-speaking  
Ministers Always Spoke French...." (horizontal %)

	<u>agree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>not sure</u>
English	38.6	48.6	12.9
French	85.3	14.7	0.0

The importance of the attitude of the refusals is even more relevant when we consider the different party responses. The majority of the Liberal party (64.3%) agreed with the suggestion to extend the use of French by French-speaking ministers, and this majority obtained in both the English and French-speaking groups within the party; the majority of French-speaking Liberals favouring the proposition (81.8%) was larger than the majority within the English-speaking Liberals (54.5%). Every French-speaking Conservative M.P., every Social Credit M.P., as well as all Cr ditistes, agreed with the suggestion. Obviously a great many English-speaking Conservatives and New Democrats were opposed. Most opposed to the suggestion, indeed, were the Members of the N.D.P.: only 22.2% agreed with the idea; 66.7% were opposed. The English-speaking Conservatives were no more inclined to agree with the statement, but they had a few more Members (19.2%) who were not sure. The majority disagreeing with the idea (57.7%) was therefore a little smaller than the comparable figure for the N.D.P.; both were substantially more inclined to disagree than the English-speaking Liberals.





Table 8.6

English-speaking Liberals', Conservatives', and New Democrats' Opinion on the Suggestion that "It Would be Better if French-speaking Ministers Always Spoke French...." (horizontal %)

	<u>agree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	54.5	39.4	6.1
Conservatives	23.1	57.7	19.2
New Democrats	22.2	66.7	11.1

The regional pattern of responses is also noteworthy. Although the contrast between Quebec and the other regions is naturally the most striking difference, it is not the most significant. Once more there seems to be a pattern in the regional responses that we have become accustomed to expect whenever the question of sympathy for or understanding of the wishes of French Canadians is at stake: although in this case they are considerably out of line with the responses of Quebec M.P.s, M.P.s from Ontario and the Maritimes are a little more in agreement with Quebec M.P.s than are M.P.s from the Prairies and British Columbia. It is only in British Columbia and in the Prairies that a majority of M.P.s are actually opposed to the idea of French-speaking Ministers always speaking in their mother tongue.



Table 8.7

M.P.s' Opinions on the Suggestion that "It Would be  
Better if French-speaking Ministers Always Spoke  
French....", by Regions (horizontal %)

	<u>agree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>not sure</u>
B.C./Yukon	30.0	60.0	10.0
Prairies	30.8	53.8	15.4
Ontario	44.1	47.1	8.8
Quebec	84.8	15.2	0.0
Maritimes	42.9	35.7	21.4
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	56	39	9

When we compared the responses of English-speaking M.P.s to the question of whether or not there is a problem of communication with those who agree or disagree with the proposition that French-speaking ministers should always speak in their mother tongue, we found that those who see no problem at all, and those who see the problem as based on differences of culture, are most inclined to disagree with the proposition. On the other hand, those who recognize a problem of language are most inclined to agree with the proposition. We also found that those who see the effect of bilingualism as creating delays in Parliament are not inclined to disagree with the proposition that French-speaking ministers should always speak French.

It might be argued that the statement under consideration in Table



8.7 is sufficiently ambiguous that not too much should be made of the results; it contains two propositions, not one. Although we might hold that the second part of the sentence ("they would express themselves more satisfactorily") should merely be seen as offering the rationale for the first part of the sentence ("It would be better if French-speaking Ministers always spoke in French") it could be argued that respondents might choose to react to either part of the statement. Following from this, then, it might be argued that many English-speaking respondents in disagreeing with the statement might in fact be saying "it is not necessary for the Minister to speak French in order for him to express himself more satisfactorily; he is doing so well enough now." It would have been better had we offered a less ambiguous statement; but the argument which we have been presenting against our position would be more convincing if other evidence did not also suggest that English-speaking M.P.s are rather less willing than French Canadians to accept the notion of full commitment to bilingualism in Parliament.

### III. The Extension of Translation Facilities

It did not require a survey of M.P.s to know that a great many French Canadians would like to see simultaneous translation facilities extended to all committees; there can be no doubt that it would make their experience of committees a far more gratifying one. In order to compare the attitudes of English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s on this matter we tested their intensity of opinion by inviting M.P.s to agree or disagree with the statement that "translation facilities should be extended to all committee rooms, whatever the cost". It is one thing to give vague approval to improving a service; it is another to accept the





implications of an idea whatever its cost.

The results are clear cut: almost one-quarter of the English-speaking M.P.s appear unprepared to support the idea of extending translation facilities to all committee rooms whereas all but one French-speaking M.P. wished to see the action taken.

Table 8.8

English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s' Opinions  
on Whether Translation Facilities Should Be Extended  
to All Committee Rooms Whatever the Cost (horizontal %)

	<u>should be extended</u>	<u>should not</u>	<u>not sure</u>
English	71.6	24.3	4.1
French	97.1	2.9	0.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	86	19	3

The majority of all M.P.s who are in favour of extension of the translation facilities is composed of majorities within each party. But the Conservative party has more M.P.s (40% of the party) opposed to the idea. Putting it another way, two-thirds of all the M.P.s opposed to the extension of translation facilities are Conservatives.<sup>4c</sup> The New

---

<sup>4c</sup>Further analysis revealed that 43.8% of those who said they were unsympathetic to French Canadians were opposed to the extension of translation facilities. Since the bulk of those unsympathetic to French Canadians are Conservatives, it is not surprising that this relationship should be revealed on the basis of party. However, 19.6% of the backbench respondents who claim to be sympathetic to French Canadians also disagreed with the extension of translation facilities.



Democrats who, judged by the results of the previous analysis, are opposed to the notion of French-speaking Ministers always speaking French, are more disposed than English-speaking Liberals to support the idea of extending the translation facilities to all committee rooms.

Table 8.9

English-speaking Liberals', Conservatives', New Democrats' and Social Crediters' Opinions on Whether Translation Facilities Should be Extended to all Committee Rooms

	Whatever the Cost (horizontal %)		
	<u>should be extended</u>	<u>should not be extended</u>	<u>not sure</u>
Liberals	80.6	16.7	2.8
Conservatives	51.9	40.7	7.4
New Democrats	88.9	11.1	0.0
Social Credit	100.0	0.0	0.0

The regional pattern of responses is in part as might be expected: Quebec M.P.s unanimously agree with the idea; M.P.s from British Columbia disagree most with the idea. But beyond that the pattern disappears: Prairie M.P.s (76.9%) are more in agreement with the idea of extending the facilities than M.P.s from Ontario or the Maritimes.

The evidence which we have just presented must not be taken as conclusive, but it certainly rings true enough with the other attitudes that we have discovered to be suggestive. Bilingualism in its present form in the House of Commons is resented by some but acceptable to most. Meaningful extensions of it, although obviously desired by nearly all the



French-speaking M.P.s, would not be favoured by a number of English-speaking M.P.s, particularly English-speaking Conservatives.

#### IV. Bilingualism Within the Political Parties

Thus far we have been concerned with bilingualism within the House of Commons as such. We now turn to look at the extent of bilingualism within the parties, as revealed at their general caucus and provincial or regional caucus meetings. Our method of attempting to discover the degree of bilingualism within the parties was to ask all M.P.s of both language groups the following questions:

22 (h) Do you (personally) speak French (English)  
at your party caucus meetings?

(If YES, Ask) Regularly?

(If Not Regularly, Ask) On what occasions do you speak  
French (English)?<sup>5</sup>

Responses for Members of the N.D.P. and Social Credit Rally, both unilingual parties, are not considered here.<sup>6</sup>

Because of the relatively small number of French-speaking Conservatives, it is not surprising that French is rarely spoken within the

---

<sup>5</sup>We did not ask M.P.s whether they regarded themselves as bilingual or not, but we may use the results of another study of the 1963 House for our purposes. This study showed that 83.3% of the French-speaking Members consider themselves bilingual, whereas only 4.8% of the English-speaking group did so. It was found that it is only in the Liberal Party that the percentage who are bilingual is larger than the number of French-speaking Members. Andrew, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>6</sup>One Cr ditiste said that party caucuses are conducted entirely in French, "sauf lorsqu'une d l gation en majorit  Anglaise assiste au caucus."





party caucus.<sup>7</sup> One French-speaking Conservative said that he always speaks French at caucus, but then the interviewer noted that "il parlera cependant un mot français un mot anglais, afin de se faire apprendre". How often he exercises this prerogative we do not know. Another French-speaking Conservative stated that he usually speaks English, reserving French for those occasions on which there is a French-speaking chairman of the caucus meeting. Between 1958 and 1962, of course, the French tongue was more often used within the Conservative caucus; before the installation of simultaneous translation facilities in the committee rooms, apparently Donald Fleming and Marcel Lambert translated for the benefit of English-speaking M.P.s who could not understand French.

None of the English-speaking Conservatives interviewed mentioned speaking French themselves on any occasions during caucus. A few Conservatives noted that they use French in greetings to French-speaking Members; another, while saying that he never speaks French in caucus, made the point that he can speak French and does so with French-speaking colleagues and very occasionally in speeches in the House of Commons. Yet another Conservative mentioned speaking French occasionally in his election campaigns. One Western Conservative mentioned that he was studying French, but added that he was not yet competent in the language.

The caucus of the Social Credit Party appears to be conducted in both English and French; none of the English-speaking Members apparently

---

<sup>7</sup>A French-speaking Conservative Frontbencher, in amplifying his reply that he personally did not speak French at the party caucus, added: "Personne ne parle Français--malheureusement. Français très rare." French is used generally within the Conservative Québec caucus meetings.



ever speaks in French, but a few French-speaking Social Crediters seem to speak English, at least when replying to an English-speaking colleague. When the Quebec Members of the party get together for discussions, of course, no English is used.

Without doubt the Liberal Party caucus is the most interesting from the point of view of the use of the French and English languages. There have always been a great many Quebec M.P.s within the parliamentary party, but rarely has the Quebec group represented proportionally so large a share of the whole. The Liberal Party therefore offers a better test case than the others of the place of the two principal languages within the proceedings of a party.

Despite the fact that simultaneous translation facilities were used in party caucus meetings in only a few months before the summer recess of 1965, the use of the French language within the caucus seems to have been a common occurrence before that. One French-speaking Liberal backbencher believes that bilingualism within the Liberal caucus is now a "fait accompli", but another Liberal interviewed in the preliminary interviews in the summer of 1964 observed a falling off in the use of French at party caucus: "At the beginning of the session the Quebec M.P.s were aggressively French-speaking; now they are still speaking French, but much more often in English."

The results of our questionnaire throw further light on the character of Liberal caucus proceedings. Just over a third of the French-speaking Liberal backbenchers stated that they never, or only very rarely, speak English at party caucus. Just under a quarter said that they always (or usually) speak English, and just over 40% said that



they sometimes speak English. One Quebec Liberal who speaks only French at party caucus does so in the conviction that "les députés anglais préfèrent que les députés canadiens-français parlent français", but there are others of his own language group who do not follow his course of action. Another Quebec Liberal who said that he mixes his English and French about equally at party caucus replied, when queried on why he speaks English as much as he does: "Car souvent les canadiens-anglais portent moins attention à l'interprétation simultanée". A number of other Quebec Liberals made the same point about their feeling that they must speak in English if they wish to be better understood; speaking for others as well as himself one Liberal stated: "si ce que le député a à dire est important il l'exprime en Anglais." Still other French-speaking M.P.s who sometimes use English in caucus do so either out of courtesy in reply to an English-speaking M.P. or in order to speed up the work of the caucus when translators are not available. One Quebec Liberal reserved the right to be flexible in his choice of the appropriate language in which to speak in caucus: "Il dépend des propos: je ne parle pas Français par devoir. Si je veux choquer', je m'adressera a eux en Anglais...."

When it comes to the English-speaking Liberals it is more relevant to talk about the few who occasionally speak in French at the party caucus rather than the vast majority who speak only in their mother tongue.<sup>8</sup> But some attempt at bilingualism is not altogether absent from among the English-speaking Liberals, and this may be important in itself. Generally speaking, however, the use of French on the part of English-speaking M.P.s

---

<sup>8</sup> There are a few fluently bilingual English Canadians who choose not to speak in French at caucus, or if they speak do so very rarely.





is reserved for extending courtesy and compliments, and making announcements. The following are representative of the occasions on which French is sometimes used by English-speaking Liberals in caucus:

I sometimes say a few sentences to show respect and courtesy to my French colleagues, but I speak very poor French. (Ontario Liberal)

When I have an announcement, I might speak French, partly in fun. (Ontario Liberal)

I rarely speak French in the party caucus, but if the discussion has been mainly in French I would. (Quebec Liberal)

I very occasionally speak French at party caucus and then only briefly and with quite a bit of preparation. (Ontario Liberal)

In addition a number of English-speaking Liberals, who do not attempt to speak in French at party caucus, will try a few sentences in conversation with their colleagues, speeches in the House of Commons, or occasionally in public speeches in their constituencies.

Nevertheless, the clear impression is that as far as English-speaking Liberals are concerned, there is no bilingual dialogue; when French is spoken it is by and large for symbolic purposes and comes as the result of careful textual preparation beforehand and not in the course of normal exchanges. That the English language is still, as one Quebec Liberal Frontbencher put it "la langue officieuse au caucus" is substantiated by the behaviour of two other French-speaking Frontbenchers. One never spoke in French in caucus before the availability of the simultaneous translation system; another, who admitted that he spoke in French fairly frequently while still a backbencher, now hardly speaks in his mother tongue.

The status of the French language within a predominantly English-



speaking provincial or regional caucus is even lower, of course. None of the French-speaking Liberals in this position ever speaks French in the course of his provincial caucus proceedings. Within the Liberal Party's Quebec caucus, however, where the majority is French-speaking, English is occasionally used; but French is the normal language of discourse. The English-speaking members, not all of whom are perfectly fluent in French, try to converse in the language of the majority.

According to one Quebec Liberal:

Les queleques députés anglais qui assistent au caucus  
(provincial) comprennent le Français. Souvent ils  
parlent en Anglais et on leur répond en Français.

Another member of the caucus who speaks only French was not so sure, however, about the success of the bilingual exchange: "on a l'impression", he said, "qu'on n'est pas compris."



## CHAPTER NINE

### FRENCH CANADIAN M.P.S IN FEDERAL POLITICS

It will be recalled that in an earlier chapter we noted that a majority of both English and French-speaking backbenchers agreed that the French Canadian M.P. feels ill-at-ease and frustrated when seeking to participate in federal politics. It is interesting that a majority of the French-speaking front benchers also agree that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics (although the same was not true of the small sample of English-speaking front benchers whom we interviewed).<sup>1</sup> It may also be recalled that we reserved for later consideration some of the reasons for this attitude, particularly since a number of questions were left begging by the analysis up to that point. It is perhaps appropriate to recapitulate the argument as developed thus far, presenting in a slightly different form the data already studied.

It was noted earlier that the responses of English and French-speaking M.P.s revealed a sharp dichotomy on the question of whether or not French-speaking M.P.s, as French Canadians, should play a specific role within their parties and/or within the House of Commons. We are now

---

<sup>1</sup> We are reasonably confident in presenting our findings as they relate to French-speaking frontbenchers, since we managed to interview eight of the ten M.P.s so classified; since our rate of interviewing English-speaking frontbenchers was so poor, we do not have the same confidence in our findings on them. On the question of whether or not the French Canadian M.P. is ill-at-ease in federal politics, six of the eight French-speaking frontbench respondents said that he is, and two said that he is not.





concerned only with the differences in responses within the French-speaking group of M.P.s. Here we find that, of the seven French-speaking respondents who indicated that they thought that the French Canadian should not play a specific role as a French Canadian, six were Liberals. No French-speaking Conservatives or Social Credit M.P.s denied a specific role to the French Canadian M.P. The only other French-speaking M.P. to agree with the six Liberals was a lone Cr ditiste.

When we asked French-speaking respondents whether or not they thought that they are successful in playing such a role, a majority of Liberals were convinced that French Canadians are successful;<sup>2</sup> French-speaking Social Crediters were disinclined to say whether or not the French Canadian is either successful or unsuccessful, but chose to say that he is sometimes successful, sometimes not. One Cr ditiste who thought that French Canadians have a role to play refused to answer the question of whether or not they are successful in doing so. Of the remaining Cr ditistes, one thought that French Canadians are successful; one said they are unsuccessful and two said that they are sometimes successful, sometimes not. One Conservative said that they are unsuccessful; another said they are sometimes successful.<sup>3</sup>

All this is essential background to the further question of whether or not French-speaking M.P.s think that the French Canadian feels ill-at-ease and frustrated when seeking to participate in federal politics, for

---

<sup>2</sup>The same opinion was found among French-speaking frontbench Liberals: four said that French Canadians are successful; one said that they are sometimes successful; and one said that they are not successful.

<sup>3</sup>There were only two French-speaking Conservatives interviewed.



when we analyzed the responses to this question we found that French-speaking Liberals are very much disposed to say that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease in federal politics. French-speaking Social Credit M.P.s are unanimous in agreeing that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease and frustrated, but the Cr ditistes and Conservatives divided evenly on the matter, half of them saying that he is not ill-at-ease.

Clearly there is no direct relationship between the belief that the M.P. is successful in fulfilling his specific role as a French Canadian, and the belief that the French Canadian is not ill-at-ease or frustrated in federal politics. Had this been the case we would have found the majority of Liberals disagreeing with the suggestion that the French Canadian is frustrated in federal politics. What factors, then, do explain the feelings of many French-speaking M.P.s that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics? It may be recalled that earlier we suggested that the answer might lie in the French Canadian's knowledge of the fundamental hostility on the part of a majority of the English-speaking M.P.s to the French Canadian's assumption of a specific role for himself; we also suggested that the answer might rest with the different role which even sympathetic English-speaking M.P.s consider appropriate,<sup>4</sup> but we were by no means confident that these went far towards a total explanation of the situation. Besides, these explanations were of little value in trying to explain why Cr ditistes should be less inclined to say that they feel frustrated in federal politics than French-speaking Liberals. On the assumption that the answers to our general questions do not lie in any single factor, we may begin by considering a

---

<sup>4</sup>See above, Chapter Seven.



number of reasonable possibilities.

We noted earlier that English-speaking Liberals were just as prepared as French-speaking M.P.s to agree that "our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation", and that "most of the time front bench policy is already decided before an M.P. has a chance to exert influence"; but we might assume that part of the explanation of the frustration which many French-speaking Liberals admit to rests with the feeling that party discipline is too strict. There is no confirmation for this assumption. When we invited respondents to express their agreement or disagreement with the statement that "party discipline is too strict today", only two French-speaking Liberals (as compared to no English-speaking Liberals) agreed. All five of the French-speaking Liberal front benchers who answered the question also disagreed with the statement. Among the other French-speaking M.P.s there was greater agreement with the statement. Although none of the French-speaking Conservative backbenchers agreed with the statement, one of the French-speaking Conservative front benchers did agree; two of the three French-speaking Social Credit M.P.s agreed, and one said he was not sure; and four of the five Cr ditistes who answered the question agreed that party discipline is too strict today. It is difficult to know whether French-speaking Social Credit M.P.s and Cr ditistes were referring to party discipline being too strict in their own parties, or whether they were thinking of the other parties, and particularly the Liberals, when they gave their answers; suffice it to say that all Cr ditistes and two of the three French-speaking Social Credit M.P.s said in answer to another of our questions that they think all votes should be free votes.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand,

---

<sup>5</sup> See question 19(d) in Appendix B.





French-speaking Liberals, like English-speaking Liberals, were far less inclined to say that all votes should be free votes (only three French-speaking Liberals and two English-speaking Liberals gave this reply); but it is interesting that several French-speaking Liberals thought that there should be a free vote whenever there is a regionally divisive issue (such as the Student Loan Bill) and on constitutional matters (such as the Fulton-Favreau formula).

Further and even more dramatic evidence that it is certainly not the strictness of party discipline which is frustrating French-speaking Liberals is provided by respondents' reactions to the statement that "the way an M.P. votes is always a true indication of the way he feels." Only 20% of the English-speaking Liberals agreed with the notion, whereas nearly 60% of the French-speaking Liberals agreed with it.<sup>6</sup> Among the other French-speaking M.P.s there was by no means agreement with the statement: one of the two French-speaking Conservatives agreed; none of the French-speaking Social Crediters, and only one of the Cr ditistes, agreed. Some insight into the reasons for the French-speaking Liberals' views, as compared with those of their English-speaking colleagues, was provided by answers to a question relating to the role of the party whip and the influence/<sup>he</sup> upon Members: only 31.4% of the English-speaking Liberals said that the Whip has no influence on their actions at all, compared with 91.3% of the French-speaking M.P.s who denied any influence on the part of the Whip. Since French-speaking Liberals are no less cohesive in their voting behaviour than English-speaking M.P.s, those figures may simply mean that French-speaking

---

<sup>6</sup> It is worth noting, however, that only one of the five French-speaking Liberal frontbenchers who answered the question agreed that the way an M.P. votes is always a true indication of the way he feels.



Liberals are somewhat more inclined to feel that it is their own feelings of loyalty to the party, and their own realistic appreciation of the consequences of failure to support the Government (with or without explicit direction or suggestion from the Whip), that motivates their actions; and that, for this reason, the way an M.P. votes is always a true indication of the way he feels.

It seems quite clear that the reasons for French Canadian M.P.s' feeling ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics do not lie in party discipline: Cr ditistes, who are the least inclined to say that the French Canadian M.P. is ill-at-ease and frustrated, are much more inclined than French-speaking Liberals to say that party discipline is too strict, and that the way in which an M.P. votes is not a true indication of the way he feels; whereas French-speaking Liberals, who are much more inclined to say that the French Canadian is frustrated, are far less inclined to say that party discipline is too strict today (less inclined indeed than their English-speaking party cohorts).

If French-speaking M.P.s' attitudes towards party discipline do not provide the answer, might it be that French-speaking M.P.s are frustrated because they feel that their ideas and opinions are not fully attended to, (especially by English-speaking M.P.s); or that they are provided with too few opportunities to make their views known? It must be admitted that none of our interview questions got at this subject directly, but we may consider the responses to two separate questions which bear, at least tangentially, on the matter. In Part B we invited respondents to agree or disagree with the following propositions:

22. Backbenchers receive far too few invitations to air their views in public.



29. When you come to Ottawa you may have great ideas, but you soon learn that ideas don't get you anywhere.

Taking the reactions to the second statement first, we find that overall just under thirty per cent of the respondents agree with the suggestion, with French-speaking Liberals being a little more inclined to agree than English-speaking Liberals. When we examined the responses according to the ages of the French-speaking Liberals, it was clear that the younger M.P.s were more inclined to agree with the suggestion than the older ones. Two of the five French-speaking front bench Liberals who answered this question agreed with the statement and three disagreed. In this instance there were no differences between the French-speaking backbench Liberals and the French-speaking Social Credit and Cr ditiste backbenchers. Neither of the French-speaking Conservative backbenchers agreed with the statement.

With regard to the question of backbench M.P.s receiving too few opportunities to air their views in public, French-speaking backbenchers are overall a little more inclined to agree than English-speaking backbenchers, but the difference is not great: 61.8% of the French-speaking respondents as compared with 45.9% of the English-speaking respondents agreed with the statement. When the responses are arrayed by party, it is clear that the difference between the two language groups is accounted for by the position of the French-speaking Liberals and Cr ditistes, both of whom are more inclined to agree than any others with the suggestion that backbenchers receive too few opportunities to air their views in public. English-speaking Conservatives are more inclined to agree with the suggestion than English-speaking Liberals, but French-speaking Liberals





are more inclined than either to agree with the statement.<sup>7</sup> Among the front bench Liberals in our sample no English-speaking M.P.s agreed with the statement, whereas two of the five front bench French-speaking Liberals agreed and three disagreed.

Taking the responses to the two propositions together, there is slight evidence of a difference in attitude here between respondents from the two language groups, although there is hardly enough variation to suggest that much of the explanation of French Canadian M.P.s' frustration can be explained in these terms. However, before leaving this line of argument altogether, we might examine the responses to another question marginally related to the subject at hand. At another point in Part B of the questionnaire we asked all respondents to indicate their reactions to the statement that "most new M.P.s learn more by keeping their mouths shut than by trying to prove how smart they are."

Overall, sixty per cent of the backbench respondents agreed with this statement. We had anticipated that M.P.s with greater experience in the House of Commons might be more inclined than the "new boys" to agree with the suggestion, and this is in fact the case; but the interesting point is that those with more than three years' experience are only slightly more inclined to agree with the statement than those with three years' experience or less: 66.7% of those with more than three years' experience, as compared with 56.1% of those with three years' experience or less, agreed. Since 80% of the French-speaking M.P.s, as compared with just a little over 50% of the English-speaking M.P.s, are in the latter category,

---

<sup>7</sup> 47.2% of the English-speaking Liberals agreed with the statement, as compared to 63.6% of the French-speaking M.P.s.



it is not surprising to find that French-speaking M.P.s are less inclined to agree than English-speaking M.P.s, but the difference is sufficiently great between M.P.s from the two principal language groups on this matter that it cannot simply be explained in terms of years of experience. Seventy per cent of the English-speaking backbenches, as compared with only 38.2% of the French-speaking backbenchers, agreed with the statement. The same general pattern is revealed among the front bench respondents: no English-speaking front benchers from either party disagreed with the statement that "most M.P.s learn more by keeping their mouths shut than by trying to prove how smart they are", whereas among the French-speaking front benchers only two agreed, three disagreed and one was not sure.

Although French-speaking Liberal backbenchers were a little more inclined to agree with the statement than French-speaking Social Credit and Cr ditiste backbenchers, the differences in viewpoint that are being attributed to differences in attitude between language groups cannot be explained simply in terms of differences between the parties. As the following table brings out clearly, there is a difference of opinion on this question within all parties as between backbench M.P.s of the two language groups.



Table 9.1

English and French-Speaking Backbenchers Agreeing with:  
 "Most M.P.s Learn More by Keeping Their Mouths Shut Than  
 by Trying to Prove How Smart They Are"  
 (Independents omitted)

	% English-speaking M.P.s agreeing with the state- ment	% French-speaking M.P.s agreeing with the state- ment
Liberals	65.7	40.9
Conservatives	76.9	50.0
New Democrats	75.0	*
Social Crediters	50.0	33.3
Créditistes	*	16.7
	<hr/>	<hr/>
N =	50	13

\* No M.P.s in the category.

In order to try to discover whether there is any relationship between disagreeing with the proposition, and feeling ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics, we arrayed responses to the statement in terms of the respondent's indication of his belief that French Canadians are or are not ill-at-ease in federal politics. When this is done, no clear pattern emerges; certainly no clear proof of a direct positive relationship is apparent. It is true that French-speaking M.P.s who do not feel that the French Canadian is frustrated in federal politics are a little more inclined than those who feel that he is frustrated to agree with the proposition: 54.5% of those who say the French Canadian is not ill-at-ease, as compared with only 30.4% of those who say he is frustrated, agree with the proposition. But when one looks at the percentages of those who actually





disagree with the statement, there is little difference between the two groups. The difference is accounted for by 17.4% of the French-speaking backbenchers, who feel that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics, and who also say that they are not sure about the proposition that "most M.P.s learn more by keeping their mouths shut...". The general conclusion we may draw is that there is a difference in attitude between English and French-speaking M.P.s on the question of the opportunities for, and the appropriateness of, backbenchers making their views known at the federal level; but there is no clear evidence that this difference in attitude accounts for the feelings of a large number of French-speaking backbenchers that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics.

It was argued earlier that the explanation for the feeling on the part of the majority of French-speaking M.P.s that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics cannot be explained by their feelings that French Canadians are unsuccessful in fulfilling the specific roles they attribute to themselves as French Canadians: few were prepared to state that the French Canadian M.P. is unsuccessful in fulfilling his role. We may nevertheless inquire whether there is any difference between the French-speaking respondents, in terms of the roles which they specify as appropriate to the French Canadian M.P., qua French Canadian. When the responses of the two groups of French-speaking backbenchers are arrayed in terms of the specific roles mentioned, we do encounter some differences in the responses. French-speaking M.P.s who say that the French Canadian is not ill-at-ease, are considerably more inclined than those who feel that he is ill-at-ease, to say that the French Canadian M.P. ought not to attempt to play a specific role: 40% of those who denied that French Canadians are



ill-at-ease in federal politics also denied that they ought to play a specific role, whereas only 12% of those who feel that French Canadians are frustrated denied a specific role to French Canadians .

The latter group of French-speaking backbenchers were also more inclined to mention the role of protecting the constitutional rights of French Canadians than those who did not feel that French Canadians are frustrated, but the difference here is relatively slight. Once again an explanation of the attitude of those who feel that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated has not been clearly offered. Something should undoubtedly be made of the differences between the two groups in terms of their disposition to think that a specific role is appropriate; the fact that many more of those who feel that French Canadians are not ill-at-ease and frustrated also felt that French Canadians should play no specific role as French Canadians may be significant. But again we would want the differences to be more striking than they are before much could be made of them, and in any case we come back to the finding that most of those who think the French Canadian should perform a specific role also think that he is successful at it at least some of the time. All the attempts thus far to explain the attitude of the majority of French-speaking M.P.s who feel that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics have been, by and large, unsuccessful. It is time to confront directly the examples offered by those who said that French Canadians are frustrated, for explanations of their attitude.

Not all the French-speaking respondents who said that French Canadians are ill-at-ease gave examples, but most did. Generally, their frustrations appear to centre around three main difficulties: the first is the problem of dealing in English either at the committee level or with



a fundamentally unilingual Civil Service in Ottawa; secondly, there are difficulties of communication with English-speaking M.P.s that spring from a profound difference in outlook; thirdly, and related closely to the second, are the difficulties confronting the French-speaking M.P. (and in particular the Quebec M.P.) when legislative matters involving the specific interests of Quebec are before the House of Commons. These problems were mentioned in roughly equal proportions by French-speaking backbench respondents, and confirmed by front benchers' responses. Two respondents gave examples which do not fit this general pattern: one French-speaking Liberal backbencher made the point that although he feels no special malaise, anyone in a minority position feels ill-at-ease. Another felt that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated "parce que les canadiens-français n'obtiennent quelque chose qu'à force de lutter." This same respondent went further:

Personnellement, je considère que mon nom est un handicap; pour moi, le fait d'être Franco-ontarien, me freine; Québec fait plus de tort dans ce cas que les Anglais; les Canadiens-français du Québec sont les plus grands adversaires des Franco-ontariens.

The following are much more representative of the examples offered by French-speaking M.P.s of the frustrating situations they confront:

Aux Comité des Comptes publics, le personnel du Département de l'Auditeur Général qui se présente pour répondre aux questions des députés ne parle pas français et nous avons le sentiment que les questionner en français, c'est les insulter. (Liberal)

Si un député ou ministre est unilingue, c'est frustrant, ça crée une certaine crainte. (Liberal)

On n'est bienvenue quand on veut parler du Québec aux Anglo-Saxons et on sent cet atmosphère nébuleux qui flotte. (Créditiste)





On commence à habituer les anglophones au phénomène français. Quoique l'on ait des amis canadiens-anglais, ceux-ci oublient d'une façon régulière le fait canadien-français. Il faut toujours être sur un "pied d'alerte". (Front bench Liberal)

Tel fut le cas lors du débat sur la nécessité d'avoir les rapports des comités en français. Les Libéraux français se sentaient gênés de ne pas soutenir une telle motion. (Créditiste)

Generally speaking there were no differences between the parties as far as the kinds of examples that were given, but perhaps merely by dint of numbers it seemed that Liberals were more inclined to mention the embarrassment and frustration associated with the discussion of controversial matters, such as "opting out" legislation, that affects (or appears to affect) only Quebec. One Quebec Liberal mentioned specifically the fear which many French-speaking Liberals have of making the English-speaking M.P.s feel that they are supporting the autonomist ambitions of Quebec, even though they feel that different arrangements could and should be made for Quebec. The same respondents stated that "on ne parle pas toujours franchement". Another noted, along the same lines, that in part the frustration of French Canadians arises from the fundamental difference in outlook which the two principal language groups entertain: centralization means efficiency to the English-speaking M.P., this respondent explained, whereas for the French Canadian M.P. decentralization means efficiency.

It is interesting that the English-speaking respondents' examples of occasions on which French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated were on the whole similar to those given by the French-speaking M.P.s. None of the English-speaking respondents mentioned the insensitivity of the English-speaking M.P.s to the French Canadian's point of view that several French-speaking M.P.s fixed on, but they were particularly appreciative of the difficulties created by the predominance of the English language in the committees and Civil Service, and also of the problem confronting him when



legislation dealing with Quebec is before the House. The following are quite typical of a number of examples given by English-speaking M.P.s of occasions on which the French Canadian M.P. feels ill-at-ease and frustrated by federal politics.

When a French-speaking civil servant replies to him in English, and when documents arrive on his desk in English, because the French one is going to be late, he wouldn't feel at home in Ottawa. (Conservative)

Some who can't communicate in English must have a complex. They are in a minority and can't communicate. (Conservative)

The reason he is frustrated is because he feels obliged to express a Quebec point of view; he's pushed into it because of the stiff opposition. The Ontario M.P. can say what he likes without the provincial government breathing down his neck. The attitude of the French Canadian M.P.s is this: "If I don't, the Cr ditistes will".. (Liberal)

There are occasions where lack of familiarity in the English language can be a handicap. Technical subject matter is often in English and translation is cumbersome. Most of them don't do enough work and few want any serious committee assignments involving work. (Liberal)

It is clear, now that we have examined the examples of frustrating experiences offered by both English and French-speaking respondents, that no single factor seems to be the cause of the French Canadian's feelings of alienation from the federal political process. In terms of altering the situation it is apparent that, for many, an improvement in attitude towards parliamentary life would follow upon the meaningful extension of bilingualism to all aspects of the operations of Parliament (at the committee level through the provision of full interpretation and bilingual stenographic services, and within the Civil Service by the establishment of the French language as a de facto means of communication with civil servants); extensions which, as has been indicated in earlier chapters, so many French-speaking M.P.s earnestly desire. Such reforms would still leave untouched



two other areas of frustration for many French Canadian M.P.s, but might go some way towards creating an atmosphere in which their problems might permit of some kind of solution.

We have not yet answered the question of why French-speaking Liberals are a little more inclined than Cr ditistes to say that French Canadians are frustrated in federal politics. One reason that might be suggested arises from the examples of frustration mentioned above: that is to say that French-speaking Liberals, in contrast to Cr ditistes, have always to think of the reaction of their English-speaking colleagues when dealing with legislation of a fiscal or constitutional nature on which the Quebec government's views have already been explicitly stated. Cr ditistes are somewhat freer to manoeuvre on controversial matters than French-speaking Liberals, who are caught between the views of their English-speaking colleagues in Ottawa and the views of a Liberal administration in Quebec. The same problem may also, to a lesser extent, have confronted French-speaking Members of the Social Credit Party, and may also help to account for the fact that all were agreed that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics.

There is a final factor worth noting because, although it was not mentioned in their examples, by any of the respondents who stated that French Canadians are ill-at-ease and frustrated, it appears to be an important feature of the same respondents' orientation to the federal political process. When we reviewed the protocols of French-speaking respondents who agreed that French Canadians are frustrated in federal politics, we were struck by the considerable number who had earlier indicated that their constituents either knew nothing of the implications of the job of M.P., or think that the M.P. is more powerful than he really is, or are





uninterested in his legislative activities and appeared to the respondent to be solely concerned with the patronage or favours that the M.P. might be able to provide. When we cross-tabulated the responses to the question: "are there any differences between what you think your job is and what your constituents think it is?" with respondents who agreed and disagreed that the French Canadian is ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics, we found that all the French-speaking respondents who had stated that their constituents are uninterested in their legislative activity appeared among the ranks of those who agreed that the French Canadian is frustrated in federal politics. The fact that all the respondents who are of the opinion that their constituents are uninterested in their legislative activities are Liberals, may help to explain why, ceteris paribus, French-speaking Liberals were more inclined than Cr ditistes to say that they feel ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics.

We do not claim that this opinion is the major factor accounting for the French-speaking M.P.'s belief that French Canadians are frustrated in federal politics. It could not be since, among French-speaking M.P.s, it was only Liberals who held the view. All we are suggesting is that, given the frustrations of federal political life which French-speaking Liberals mentioned explicitly, dissatisfaction, especially with the attitude which they feel many of their constituents possess towards the "lawmaking" aspects of their own role perceptions, helps to deepen their frustration with the situation in which they find themselves in Ottawa.



## CHAPTER TEN

### CONCLUSIONS

We have now examined from a variety of angles the role perceptions, role performance, and general attitudes of a large sample of Canadian M.P.s. Although differences based on region, party, and other variables make impossible a characterization of the English Canadian M.P. or the French Canadian M.P., it should be clear that the most persistently significant distinctions between our respondents appear in terms of the Member's principal language group. It has been observed that, in general, perceptions of the role of the M.P., and also perceptions of the place of the back bencher within the legislative process, differ little between Members of the two principal language groups. This is not to say that one single notion of the Member's representational, areal, and purposive roles dominates all Members of the House of Commons; the truth is that a considerable variety of perceptions exist within the group as a whole. What it does mean is that, with a few exceptions, variations in role perceptions are more or less evenly distributed among respondents of the two linguistic groups.

This study has not dealt systematically with the genesis of, or adaptation to, legislative roles. Broadly, we may assume that role perception and role adaptation will be related inter alia to the traditions of the M.P.'s constituency, his formative political experiences, his party's position within the House (government or opposition), his intra- and extra-



legislative experiences and influences, and his personality.<sup>1</sup> It was only at one point in the analysis, where we dealt with respondents' views on whether there are any differences between their own and their constituents' views of the job of M.P., that we received a suggestion of the relationship between role perception and the traditions or character of the constituency. Our study did not sort out cause and effect, but it must be noted that the perceptions (and behaviour) of the strikingly dissimilar Maritime Member and the British Columbia Member appear to be reflected in (or induced by) equally different perceptions on the part of their constituents. Quebec M.P.s, largely French-speaking Liberals, appear to be confronted by a situation in which their own perceptions of the role are out of phase with those of their constituents. The gap between the "préfect d'administration" expectations of their constituents, and their own "Lawmaker" perceptions of the M.P.'s role, is, as we noted, irritating and perhaps even frustrating. (It will be interesting to see whether traditions will be stronger than the "New Men".) In any case, if efforts are to be made to effect a new image of the federal M.P. in the province of Quebec, more Quebec M.P.s will have to take seriously the task which they nearly all agree is desirable, that of informing and educating their constituents about what goes on in Parliament. They must take advantage of the most modern means of communication which are now being more fully utilized by their English-speaking colleagues.

If French-speaking and English-speaking M.P.s were not clearly distinguishable in terms of their role perceptions, there were, on the other hand, clear differences in the manner in which they performed their roles,

---

<sup>1</sup>On the personality aspects of role adaptation see J.D. Barber, The Lawmakers, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1965, especially pp. 212-258.





and in the attitudes which they held towards many aspects of the parliamentary system. All things considered, French-speaking M.P.s were much more critical of parliamentary life than their English-speaking colleagues: they were much more disposed to say that the House of Commons and Senate are not effective as institutions; they were more disposed to say that there is nothing they would miss if they suddenly left political life; they did not feel at home in Ottawa as a city; and they were very much inclined to say that the French Canadian feels ill-at-ease and frustrated in federal politics.

Some of the irritants for French-speaking M.P.s have been or are being removed. French-speaking M.P.s, it may be recalled, were even more concerned than English-speaking M.P.s that procedural reforms are necessary for the House of Commons, and some procedural reforms have since been implemented. They were also critical of the quality of the personnel in federal politics, but we have no idea whether they think there has been any change in this regard. It is also of great importance to French Canadians that interpretation and bilingual stenographic facilities be extended to serve all committees, and again certain improvements have been made since many respondents were interviewed. Simultaneous interpretation facilities are now available for Liberal Party caucuses and several other committee rooms. As of March 1, 1966, there were seven committee rooms intended for use with simultaneous interpretation; five already in service and two in prospect. There were also, as of the same date, twelve interpreters in the Civil Service on the strength of the Bureau of Translations, which is part of the Department of the Secretary of State. The authorized strength has apparently been raised to 18, and an attempt has been made to fill vacant



positions by open competition.

It seems vital that sufficient provision be made, both in terms of equipped rooms and of available personnel, to meet the peak demand on committee rooms. What peak demand will be under the new provisions governing the use of committees is undoubtedly somewhat difficult to judge, but it can be safely said that more interpreters, to say nothing of bilingual stenographers, will have to be found before anyone can be complacent about the facilities available. At the moment the Speaker is not responsible for the appointment of interpreters; nor is he consulted about the number required. There may be a case for placing responsibility for these matters, apart from the actual function of employing personnel, under the Speaker, who under the guidance of the Chief Interpreter and in close liaison with the House Leader may be able to work out requirements. The needs in terms of servicing the House of Commons and Senate can reasonably be predicted for any session; the problem will be to achieve maximum flexibility in the use of a relatively small staff of interpreters, and this can hardly be done effectively apart from as full information as possible about the likely scale of committee work within a given period. The aim must be to have sufficient reserves within the system to meet even unusual peak demands on interpreters' time within the committees, for anything less than a fully serviced committee is unsatisfactory, especially from the point of view of French Canadian M.P.s, many of whom have been discouraged from participating in committee proceedings by conditions as they have existed in the past.

It must be recalled that a majority of M.P.s overall were agreed that bilingualism causes difficulties at the committee level. A number of English-speaking M.P.s mentioned the difficulties that are created when



French-speaking M.P.s insist on interpretation or stenographic facilities as one reason for having become unsympathetic towards French Canadians. The analysis has shown also that, although within the entire sample of English-speaking back bench respondents only 24.3% were opposed to the extension of translation facilities to all committee rooms whatever the cost, among those who were unsympathetic 43.8% were opposed. Even among those sympathetic to French Canadians, nearly 20 per cent were opposed. There were also a considerable number of back benchers (especially English-speaking) who felt that bilingualism in the House of Commons is expensive and wasteful of time. Among government front benchers (as far as we can tell) there is a difference of opinion over the effect of bilingualism on the House of Commons: whereas no French-speaking front bencher mentioned any special effect of bilingualism (apart from the obvious fact that it is easier for the M.P. to speak in his mother tongue), three of the six English-speaking Liberal front benchers interviewed said that bilingualism causes delays and four said that it is expensive. It should not be thought, therefore, that the provision of facilities permitting full bilingualism within the committee system will be popular with all M.P.s. But it is worthwhile recalling the degree of support which such full bilingualism has from both principal language groups: among back bench respondents French-speaking M.P.s were, with one exception, totally in favour, over 70% of the English-speaking respondents were also in favour. Among front bench M.P.s all but two of the respondents interviewed agreed with the extension of facilities; one Liberal was not sure and one Conservative was opposed.

An examination of the attitudes of back bench and front bench Members of the Liberal party in the 26th Parliament revealed a strong disposition to extend simultaneous interpretation facilities to all committee





rooms, whatever the cost. There is no prima facie evidence that this position is much altered within the Liberal party today. There is thus a strong case for a government commitment to provide all committees with fully adequate services for the conduct of proceedings in the two principal languages. Essentially such action would merely carry out the implications of the government's present policy, but there might well be considerable advantages attendant upon a clear restatement of the principle of full practical equality of language within the House of Commons and its committees, especially if such a statement were linked with other reforms designed to assure equal language status within the House of Commons. Such a statement might undercut all harrassing criticism of the status of the French language within committees (thus lessening further alienation of both English and French-speaking M.P.s from committee work and from each other) and might go some way towards creating the kind of favourable atmosphere in which French-speaking M.P.s are likely to feel, at least a little more than they now do, at home.

Reforms of this kind must also confront directly the question of bilingualism in the Speakership of the House of Commons. As has already been pointed out, a number of English-speaking and French-speaking M.P.s agree that the Speaker must be bilingual. But if this is to be operative, every step must be taken to assure that the Speaker, his Deputy and the Deputy Chairman of Committees are fully bilingual. The day is past when we can be satisfied with a system in which the two principal language groups are merely formally represented in the institutions of the House of Commons. If bilingualism is to be a feature of the conduct of business in the House of Commons, then it must be accepted in all of its implications. The pairing in the Speakership of an essentially unilingual English Canadian with a more or less bilingual French Canadian is not good enough. If no



Member who desires to participate fully in the work of the House of Commons is to be discriminated against, then all Members must be served by officials equally capable in either of the two principal languages of the country. If this principle were accepted, and if it were thought appropriate that the Speaker should also take on responsibilities for the general supervision of the interpretation facilities for the House and its committees, there is a strong case for the establishment of a permanent Speakership and deputy speakership. Quite apart from other possible justifications of this step, there are distinct advantages as far as the creation of a de facto bilingual House of Commons is concerned. With their added duties the Speaker and his assistant should be relieved of all need to perform any of the traditional tasks of the M.P. Since relatively few men would meet the higher standards imposed by the criterion of full bilingual competence, there may be clear advantages in assuring the continued services of such men as may be recruited to the tasks.

There is also a need to incorporate into any concrete proposals for the creation of de facto bilingualism practical improvements in written translations as well. The analysis that is the base for this report shows that improvements in the translation system for documents are wanted and, despite the considerable changes that have been effected in recent years, still needed. Late and delayed translations are still complained of, and the quality of translation continues to be a cause of concern on occasion. Here again is a distinction between French and English Canadian M.P.s, for the translation services are the particular preoccupation of the French-speaking, even when what is involved is the translation into English of materials in French. Yet if members from both language groups are to be enabled to discharge their functions adequately, the translation system is



clearly the business of the whole House. The costs of bilingualism were referred to frequently by some of our respondents, but an efficiently bilingual House of Commons will have to accept the financial implications of full bilingualism. Since qualified translators are scarce, the implications may include the establishment within the public service of proper training facilities for the kind of translators desired, as well as higher salaries for those who qualify.

There are two further reforms that are necessary to make French Canadian M.P.s feel more involved in federal politics. The feasibility and the effectiveness of a greater degree of bilingualism in the Civil Service, especially in Ottawa, depends on the government's actions and this Commission's other studies and recommendations; there can be no doubt, however, that a great many French Canadian M.P.s would benefit from the reform, so that their experience of federal politics would be that much more satisfying. Similar results might also follow from the creation of a bilingual federal district centred on Ottawa and Hull. Many French-speaking M.P.s are not at home in Ottawa as it now is (although a great many English-speaking M.P.s do not seem to appreciate this fact). Any reforms in this direction (which again depend on the conclusions of other Commission studies as to its desirability and feasibility) would help to create a more favourable milieu in which to live and work, and thus make involvement in federal politics a more satisfying experience.

The recommendations presented thus far would undoubtedly help to create a setting more congenial to French Canadians, however fluent they may be in the English language. (It is relevant to note again that even fluently bilingual French Canadians often find it a strain to have to speak for a prolonged period in English, so that the observation made by a number of





English-speaking respondents, to the effect that the French Canadians ought to speak English just because they can, involves yet another gap in understanding.) The reforms suggested cannot be guaranteed to improve the communication of ideas between the two principal language groups. We have seen that, despite the fact that nearly a third of the M.P.s in both principal linguistic groups do not think there is a problem of communication between English and French Canadians, much of the evidence we have presented argues the contrary. It may be recalled that it was frequently observed that differences in viewpoint existed between English and French-speaking M.P.s within the same political party. There were a few important instances (for example, on whether the French Canadian feels at home in Ottawa, and whether the French Canadian as a French Canadian should play a specific role in the House of Commons and within his party) when there were sharp differences between Members from the two principal language groups within the same party. These differences suggested that the possibilities for closer communication of ideas between the two groups within the same political party do not necessarily guarantee a better understanding of the other group's point of view. We also observed that when Members agreed that there is a problem of communication between English and French Canadians, respondents did not see the problem in the same way and therefore tended to recommend different solutions to it.

The results of this study will provide ample evidence, for those who wish it, that there are clear differences of viewpoint among Canadian M.P.s based not on linguistic differences, but on regional, party and other factors; but this should not be allowed to obscure the great significance of the differences between Members of the two principal language groups. It must be admitted that this study has focused on "perceptions of others" in terms



of perceptions of the "other language group". We might have made more than we did of perceptions of others in terms of party or regional variations. But it has not been our purpose to suggest that differences of perception are based solely on language differences, nor has it been our purpose to suggest that self-perceptions and perceptions of self by others ought to be the same. All we are asserting is that sharp differences of this kind do exist, and that Members would do well to appreciate their extent and importance.

However, we cannot assume that greater appreciation of the differences between the attitudes and perceptions of Members of the two principal language groups will necessarily lead to greater understanding of others, or to an improvement in relations between the two principal language groups. Some of the most perceptive Members of the House of Commons will have known intuitively most of the major findings of this report in any case; but we still do not know how they will react to the detailed presentation of these differences, which this study has attempted to carry out with some rigour. For some Members, especially those who failed to appreciate the extent of the differences that exist, or the extent to which a problem of communication obtains between M.P.s, their worst repressed suspicions about the other group may be confirmed. Others may take comfort from the many points on which there appears to be general consensus among all groups within the House. The vast majority of M.P.s in the 26th Parliament under consideration, it must be remembered, declared themselves sympathetic to the members of other principal language group. It is our hope that greater knowledge of the facts will act as a catalyst for the conversion of sympathy into further understanding.

Ultimately, the degree of understanding will depend upon the extent and the quality of personal relationships between Members of the two



principal language groups. Personal contact with Members of the other language group was shown to be an important factor in making respondents more sympathetic to Members of the other principal language group; but sympathy based on vague feelings of fondness for a group or individual is no substitute for an intellectual appreciation of the specific content of a group's or individual's attitudes. Every effort should be made to provide facilities in which to maximize the possibilities for informal, social contact between Members. Greater social contact between Members, especially between Members of the two principal language groups, is not an end in itself, but must be regarded as a means by which, hopefully, Members will communicate informally their values, beliefs and ideas.

We cannot assume that even if Members manage to arrive at a better intellectual understanding of the variety of opinion that exists between Members of the two principal language groups, the accommodation of interests will inevitably follow: certain problems may present no acceptable grounds for compromise; events outside the control of the federal government may shape situations more effectively than the intentions of federal politicians. Nevertheless, on the assumption that Members have an interest in retaining (some might say creating) a viable central government in Canada, there are a number of specific courses of action open to the federal government which at least offer hope of maximizing the chances of success.





## APPENDIX A

Further note on "An examination of the way  
in which Parliament reflects Canadian cultural dualism", etc.

The purpose of the study is to examine the way in which the House of Commons reflects Canadian cultural dualism. The study in particular seeks:

1. To discover the role perception of M.P.s and to ascertain significant ethnic, regional, party or urban-rural variations.
2. To ascertain the degree to which M.P.s regard politics as a full time occupation, and to ascertain the nature of their other commitments, if any.
3. To examine the relationship between certain structural features - the caucus, committees, bilingual speaker and the M.P.'s performance of his role (with special references to differences between language groups).
4. To ascertain how the bilingual/bicultural phenomenon affects the operations of Parliament.
5. To examine the channels of communication of ideas and influence between and within parties, and especially between English and French M.P.s and public.

### METHOD.

A carefully constructed stratified sample, comprising 64% of the backbenchers in the House of Commons, has been interviewed, together with as many of the front benchers as will consent to be interviewed.

The considerable quantity of material made available in these interviews will form the core of the report in this project. Other studies will be used together with the interviews (e.g. surveys of Hansard, unstructured interviews, statistical compilations of biographical data), but the main emphasis will be on the results of the interviews. References to the institutional arrangements of Parliament are included in the interviews, and these references will be supplemented by additional material from non-interview sources.

Professor J.D. Hoffman will be a co-author of the report, and as such entitled to all credits as co-author with Professor Norman Ward.

June 30, 1965.



## APPENDIX B

## INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CANADIAN BACKBENCH M.P.S.\*

## Part A

One of things we are most interested in is how Canadians get into public life.

- \* 1. How did you first become interested in politics?  
(PROBE FOR FORMATIVE INFLUENCES)
- \* 2. Did any particular person or group encourage you to enter active politics? (PROBE CIRCUMSTANCES)
- \* 3. (IF NOT ALREADY MENTIONED) How did you come to run as a candidate for the ..... party?
4. Have you ever been a candidate for another party? No...../  
Yes ...../  
  
which one (s) .....
5. Have you ever been a supporter of another political party?  
No...../  
Yes...../  
which one(s).....
6. How does your local riding association nominate its candidates?
7. Were you opposed at your last nominating meeting? Yes..... No.....  
Now I want to shift to ask you a few questions about the job of being an M.P.
- \* 8. First, how would you describe the job of being an M.P.? What are the most important things you should do as a Member of Parliament?  
(PROBE FOR A FULL DESCRIPTION, ATTEMPTING TO GET R TO RANK ROLES IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE. IF THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT HE DOES AND WHAT HE THINKS HE OUGHT TO DO, GET BOTH, MAKING SURE TO DISTINGUISH IN YOUR NOTES THE ACTUAL FROM THE IDEAL.)
- \* 9. Do you think most M.P.s from other parties would describe the job in much the same way as you have? (IF NOT) How would they differ?

\* Questions marked with an asterisk were also used in the interviews with Front bench M.P.s.



- \* 10. Do you think most M.P.s from other provinces would describe the job in much the same way as you have? (IF NOT) How would they differ?
- \* 11. (IF AFTER PROBING FOR A FULL DESCRIPTION IN 8, R HAS NOT MENTIONED "PROVINCIAL SPOKESMAN", ASK)  
Some members sometimes mention the job of acting as a provincial spokesman as part of their role as M.P.  
  - (a) Do you think this is properly the job of an M.P.?
  - (b) Do you regard this as part of your job?
- \* 12. Are there any differences between the way you now think of the job of M.P. and the way you thought of it before you came to Ottawa?
- \* 13. Do you think there are any important differences between what you think your job is and what your constituents think it is? (What are they?) (PROBE FOR R'S CONCEPTION OF THE REALISM OF THE DEMANDS PUT UPON HIM)
- 14. (a) From what sources do you get the most accurate and useful information about the feelings of your constituents on political issues? (RECORD R'S ANSWER, THEN ASK)  
  - (b) (SHOW CARD) How would you rank the following in terms of their usefulness in providing good information and advice on political issues?
    - editorials in local newspapers
    - letters to the editor in local newspapers
    - party leaders and workers in your constituency
    - business leaders
    - local government officials
    - union leaders
    - church leaders
    - leaders of ethnic associations
    - personal friends and acquaintances
- \* (c) What do you do to maintain contact with your local party organization?
- (d) What do you do to maintain contact with local party notables and followers?
- \* (e) How much mail do you get from your constituents in an average week?
- \* (f) What subjects predominate?
- \* (g) Are there other ways your constituents try to communicate with you? (PROBE FOR DEPUTATIONS, PRESSURE GROUPS, FREQUENCY AND APPROVAL OF SAME.)





- \* 15. Some M.P.s regard it as part of their job to inform and educate their constituents about what goes on in Parliament. How do you feel about this?
- \* 16. (a) By what means do you normally communicate with your constituents?  
(PROBE FULLY)
- \* (b) By what means do you make yourself available to your constituents?
- \* (c) When the House is in session, approximately how many days a month do you spend in your constituency?
- 17. We know that an M.P.'s personal views and those of his party will not always be in line. Supposing you wished to take a certain stand on an issue which you knew was different from the majority view of your party, what would you probably do?  
(PROBE DEEPLY. IF R CLAIMS HE WOULD ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE THE PARTY UNOFFICIALLY, EXPLORE FULLY THE CHANNELS HE WOULD PROBABLY PURSUE. IF R SAYS THAT IT WILL DEPEND ON CIRCUMSTANCES, TRY TO DISCOVER WHAT THESE ARE.)
- 18. Suppose that you wanted to take a certain stand on an issue before the House, but you knew that a majority of the people in your constituency would want you to take another stand, what would you probably do then?
  - b) (IF R WOULD ATTEMPT TO CHANGE HIS CONSTITUENTS' OPINION, ASK)  
What means would you use to change their views? (PROBE FULLY)
  - c) And if you were not able to change the views of many people in your constituency, what would you probably do then?
- 19. a) If an issue ever arose in which your party's position was at odds with the wishes of most of your constituents, would you be more likely to go along with the party, or more likely to go along with your constituents?
- \* b) In what circumstances is an M.P. justified in voting contrary to his party's position?
- \* c) In what circumstances is an M.P. justified in voting contrary to the views of his constituents?
- \* d) In what circumstances should there be a free vote?
- 20. How many times in the present Parliament have you voted against your party?
- \* 21. (a) Would you say that being an M.P. is a full-time occupation, or that it is possible to be a good M.P. and have other commitments as well?



- \* 21. (b) Besides being an M.P., what other commitments do you have?
- \* (c) IF R MENTIONS COMMITMENTS ASK) How much time, on the average, do these commitments take during the parliamentary session?
- 22. (a) How frequently does your party caucus meet?
- \* (b) How often do you attend your party caucus: always, usually, sometimes, rarely, never?
  - always.....
  - usually.....
  - sometimes.....
  - rarely.....
  - never.....
- \* (c) What do you see as the TWO main functions of your party caucus?
- \* (d) Is a party caucus decision binding on all members?
- \* (e) (IF NOT) Under what conditions will it not be binding?
- (f) Do you, (personally) speak English at your party caucus meetings?
- (g) (IF YES, ASK) Regularly? (IF NOT REGULARLY) On what occasions do you speak English?
- \* (h) Do you, (personally) speak French at your party caucus meetings?
- \* (i) (IF YES, ASK) Regularly? (IF NOT REGULARLY, ASK) On what occasions do you speak French?
- \* 23. (a) Are you a member of a regional or provincial caucus? Which?
  - Yes: regional
  - Yes: provincial
  - No : neither(IF R IS NOT MEMBER OF A PARTY WITH A REGIONAL OR PROVINCIAL CAUCUS, GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 24) (IF YES TO "a" ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS)
- \* (b) How frequently does it meet?
- \* (c) How often do you attend your provincial (regional) caucus?  
(READ ANSWER CATEGORIES)
  - always.....
  - usually.....
  - sometimes.....
  - rarely.....
  - never.....
- \* (d) What are the two main functions of your provincial (regional) caucus?



- \* 23. (e) Is a provincial (regional) caucus decision binding on all members of the provincial (regional) caucus?
- (f) (IF NOT) Under what conditions will it not be binding?
- (g) Do you personally speak English at your provincial (regional) caucus?
- (h) (IF YES) Regularly? (IF NOT REGULARLY) On what occasions do you speak English?
- (i) Do you, personally, speak French at your provincial (regional) caucus?
- (j) (IF YES) Regularly? (IF NOT REGULARLY) On what occasions do you speak French?
24. (a) Coming back again to your job as M.P., what do you find are the most pressing problems in trying to do your job? What are the things which hinder your task? (GO BEYOND GENERAL STATEMENTS SUCH AS "LACK OF TIME": GET SPECIFIC THINGS WHICH PREVENT R FROM DOING THE JOB THE WAY HE WOULD LIKE TO. PROBE FOR RELATIONS ESTABLISHED BETWEEN CIVIL SERVANTS AND M.P.s TO DEAL WITH CONSTITUENCY BUSINESS, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE EXTENT AND LEVEL OF CIVIL SERVICE CO-OPERATION AND THEIR LANGUAGE FACILITY)
- (b) What reforms would you make if you could?
- \* 25. Now let's talk about the role of the House of Commons as a whole and its place in our system of government.
- (a) As you see it, what role should the House of Commons play in our governmental system? (PROBE FOR ROLE OF COMMONS VIS-A-VIS CABINET)
- \* (b) How effective is the House of Commons in fulfilling the role you think it should play? (PROBE FOR SPECIFIC FAILURES OF COMMONS IF R HAS ANY IN MIND)
- \* (c) (IF R SEES A GAP BETWEEN WHAT COMMONS DOES AND WHAT IT OUGHT TO BE DOING, ASK) What are the most pressing problems which prevent the House of Commons from doing what you think it ought to be doing?
- \* 26. Coming now to the Senate, what role do you think the Senate should play in our system of government?
- \* (b) How effective is the Senate in fulfilling this role? (PROBE FOR SPECIFIC FAILURES OF SENATE IF R HAS ANY IN MIND)





27. It is sometimes said that, for all the differences of opinion that may from time to time be revealed across the floor of the House of Commons, the ordinary backbenchers achieve a better understanding of one another's point of view than is often imagined. How do you feel about this view?

\* 28. (a) Who are some of your closest friends in the House of Commons -- I mean the members you most often see outside the chamber, at lunch or dinner, or at parties or social gatherings? (TRY TO GET SIX NAMES)

\* (b) Can you give any examples of occasions on which, from your own experience, informal contacts with other M.P.s have

(i) actually made you more sympathetic to a view to which you were originally opposed?

(ii) ....made you less sympathetic?

\* 29. (a) Do you think there is a problem of communication between French and English-speaking M.P.s? (IF YES) What is the problem?

\* (b) (IF PROBLEM SEEN, ASK) What, if anything, is being done to solve this problem?

\* (c) Have you personally done anything to help solve it? (IF SO) What?

(d) What M.P.s do you tend to turn to for a deeper understanding of the French Canadian point of view? (TRY TO GET 3 NAMES)

\* (e) Are there any personalities (writers, editorialists, social scientists, politicians) whose point of view you listen to with respect and interest on the subject of relations between English and French-speaking Canada? (TRY TO GET 6 NAMES)

\* 30. What, in your opinion, is the effect of bilingualism upon the operations of Parliament? (PROBE FOR PROBLEMS AT COMMITTEE AND CAUCUS LEVEL, IN THE LIBRARY AND FOR PERSONAL PROBLEMS CREATED)

\* (b) Do you find the present translation service fully satisfactory? (PROBE FOR SERVICE IN THE HOUSE AS WELL AS WRITTEN TRANSLATION. PROBE FOR DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN ITS ACTUAL OPERATION (IN COMMONS) AND ITS ABSENCE (IN SOME COMMITTEES))

(c) What part does the Speaker play in operating the bilingual system?

\* 31. How would you describe the role of the party leaders in the House of Commons? (PROBE FULLY. WE ARE INTERESTED, NOT ONLY IN R'S CONCEPTION OF HIS LEADER'S ROLE, BUT ALSO THE ROLES OF OTHER PARTY LEADERS)



- \* 31. (b) What would you say are the main reasons for the influence your party leaders have over your party?
- (c) i) Do you have much personal contact with the leadership of your party?  
ii) Whom do you tend to see most often?  
iii) How frequently?  
iv) On what sorts of occasions?  
v) What influence does your party whip have on you?  
vi) How does he influence your actions?  
vii) Is your party whip's office bilingual?
- (d) Are there any particular ministers in the Government to whom you naturally turn for information, advice and assistance? (TRY TO GET NAMES) How often? On what kinds of occasions?
32. Coming back to your own interests, what would you say are your main political interests?
- (b) What are the most useful and important things you can do to further these interests? (PROBE FOR THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN WHAT HE DOES AND WHAT HE WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO DO)
- (c) (IF NOT ALREADY MENTIONED) Have you ever found it worthwhile to form an unofficial group within your party to pursue your common interests? (TRY TO DISCOVER WHETHER GROUPS ARE DISCOURAGED BY PARTY LEADERSHIP)
- \* 33. What in your opinion are the main qualities of a good M.P.?
- \* (b) Do you think your opinion about this would be shared by M.P.s from other parties? (IF NOT) How would they differ?
- (c) Do you think your view would be shared by M.P.s from other provinces? (IF NOT) How would they differ?
- \* 34. (a) Are there, in your opinion, many occasions on which a French Canadian M.P. feels ill-at-ease and frustrated when seeking to participate in federal politics?
- \* (b) Can you give any examples?
- \* 35. (a) Do you think that the French Canadian M.P., as a French Canadian, should play a specific role in the House of Commons and in his party?
- \* (b) What role should he play?
- \* (c) Does he succeed in practice in playing such a role?



- \* 36. (a) Do you think that the English Canadian M.P., as an English Canadian, should play a specific role in the House of Commons and in his party?
- \* (b) What role should he play?
- \* (c) Does he succeed in practice in playing such a role?
- \* 37. (a) Has your general attitude towards French Canadians changed since you became an M.P.?
- \* (b) (IF SO) How has it changed?
- \* (c) What has contributed to the change?
- \* 38. Do you think that one loses money in politics, even if one wins the election and gets the indemnity?
- \* 39. (a) Do you expect to run for Parliament again? Yes..... No..... DK.....
- \* (b) (IF YES OR NO) Why?
- 40. Are there any public offices you would like to seek sometime in the future? (IF YES) Which one(s)
- \* 41. (a) If for some reason you had to give up being an M.P. today, what would you miss the most?
- \* (b) What would you miss the least?
- \* 42. (a) Do you live in Ottawa?
- \* (b) Is your family here?
- \* (c) Is Ottawa the kind of place a French Canadian M.P. can feel at home in?
- \* (d) Is Ottawa the kind of place an English Canadian M.P. can feel at home in?
- \* (e) Is it a suitable capital city for Canada?





Part B

We have collected some statement that have been made by M.P.s and others about their life and work. You may well find them over-simplified; but we would like to get your general reaction to each statement. They are, of course, all matters of opinion, so there are no correct or incorrect answers. Would you please check the response which best indicates your agreement or disagreement with the statement.

- |   |       |               |          |                  |          |
|---|-------|---------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| 1. Most of the time front bench policy is already decided before a back-bencher has a chance to exert influence.              | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 2. An M.P. can tell most of the time what his constituents will think about an issue before he even asks them.                | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 3. It would be better if French-speaking ministers always spoke in French; they would express themselves more satisfactorily. | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 4. The welfare services an M.P. performs for his constituents are important in getting him re-elected.                        | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 5. Dominion-Provincial conferences detract from the importance of Parliament.   | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 6. Politics is a dirty game.  | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 7. The local party organization has had very little to do with getting me elected.  | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |



8.	A Senate conceived of as a "Chamber of Nationalities", representing English and French in equal proportions, would be a useful reform to our parliamentary system.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
9.	People tend to judge a party by the quality of its leader.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
10.	The provincial caucus is an unwelcome and disruptive addition to the party system in the House of Commons.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
11.	Most new M.P.s learn more by keeping their mouths shut than by trying to prove how smart they are.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
12.	The way an M.P. votes is always a true indication of the way he feels.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
13.	People continually overrate the importance of the party caucus. It is a place to let off steam, perhaps, but it is not a place for influencing policy.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
14.	The Quebec M.P. tends to be more concerned with looking after his constituents than with national policies.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
15.	M.P.s, in view of the demands made upon them, are chronically under-paid?	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
16.	Experience on the back-benches is absolutely essential before a man should be given a cabinet post.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree



17. The Commons would be a more efficient institution if it were cut to, say, 150 members, each with paid assistants.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
18. Most constituents are more interested in the services an M.P. can perform for them than in his views on legislation before the House.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
19. Party discipline is too strict today.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
20. The notion of alternating the leadership of political parties from English Canadians to French Canadians is a good one and ought to be followed generally.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
21. Often M.P.s get so involved in affairs in Ottawa that they lose touch with their constituents.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
22. Backbenchers receive far too few invitations to air their views in public.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
23. Most constituents will respect you all the more if you stick to your own views in face of their opposition.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
24. The main concern of the English Canadian M.P. is not to rock the party boat.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree
25. The House of Commons should equip itself with a more extensive professional staff in order to have its own sources of technical information.	agree	tend to agree	not sure	tend to disagree	disagree





- |   |       |               |          |                  |          |
|---|-------|---------------|----------|------------------|----------|
| 26. Our parliamentary system assumes that backbenchers will play a minor role in framing legislation.   | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 27. English Canadian M.P.s enjoy more freedom from their party organizations than French Canadian M.P.s   | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 28. Translation facilities should be extended to all committee rooms, whatever the cost.  | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 29. When you come to Ottawa you may have great ideas, but you soon learn that ideas don't get you anywhere.   | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |
| 30. Constituents are always asking M.P.s to do something which has nothing to do with their jobs in Ottawa; more often than not it turns out to be a provincial or even a municipal matter. | agree | tend to agree | not sure | tend to disagree | disagree |



BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Part C

1. Where were you born?
2. What is your age?
3. How many years have you lived in the constituency which you represent? If not living in the constituency, where do you live?
4. What was the highest level of education which you reached?
5. Do you have any professional degrees? What?
6. (a) What was the original national background of your family on your father's side?  
  
(b) On your mother's side?
7. What was your father's usual occupation while you were growing up?
8. What is your own primary occupation (aside from being an M.P.)?
9. Was this your occupation when you entered politics?  
YES NO (IF NOT) What?
10. (a) What governmental or party positions -- local, provincial or federal -- had you held before becoming an M.P.? (LIST ALL PLEASE)  
  
(b) Do you hold any such positions now? (What are they?)
11. How many years altogether have you been an M.P.?
12. What newspapers and magazines do you regularly read?
13. Are there any books which have made a deep impression on you and have helped shape your political career?



INTERVIEW DES DEPUTES CANADIENS (BACKBENCH)

Nous sommes particulièrement intéressés à savoir comment les Canadiens en arrivent à la vie publique.

- \* 1. D'où viennent vos premiers intérêts à la politique? (EXPLOREZ LES INFLUENCES FORMATRICES)
- \* 2. Y a-t-il en particulier, un individu ou un groupe qui vous ait encouragé à la politique active? (EXPLOREZ LES CIRCONSTANCES)
- \* 3. (SI NON MENTIONNE) Comment êtes-vous devenu candidat du parti .....?
- 4. Avez-vous déjà été le candidat d'un autre parti? Non...../ Oui...../  
lequel (lesquels).....
- 5. Avez-vous déjà appuyé un autre parti politique? Non...../ Oui...../  
lequel (lesquels).....
- 6. Comment votre association de comté procède-t-elle à la nomination de ses candidats?
- 7. Lors de la dernière séance de nomination, étiez-vous le seul candidat de votre association? Oui..... Non.....  
J'aimerais maintenant vous poser quelques questions sur le métier de député.
- \* 8. D'abord, pouvez-vous décrire le métier de député? Quelles sont, à votre avis, les fonctions les plus importantes que devrait exercer un membre du Parlement? (RECHERCHEZ UNE DESCRIPTION COMPLETE EN ESSAYANT D'AMENER R A DEFINIR CES ROLES PAR ORDRE D'IMPORTANCE. S'IL Y A DIFFERENCE ENTRE CE QU'IL FAIT ET CE QU'IL PENSE QU'IL DEVRAIT FAIRE, OBTENEZ LES DEUX EN DISTINGUANT BIEN DANS VOS NOTES ENTRE PRATIQUE ET IDEAL.)
- \* 9. Pensez-vous que la plupart des députés des autres partis décriraient leurs fonctions de la même façon que vous venez de le faire? (SI NON) En quoi différeraient-ils?
- \* 10. Pensez-vous que la plupart des députés des autres provinces décriraient leurs fonctions de la même façon que vous venez de le faire? (SI NON) En quoi différeraient-ils?
- \* 11. (SI DANS LA DESCRIPTION COMPLETE DE SON TRAVAIL A LA QUESTION 8, R N'A PAS MENTIONNE "PORTE-PAROLE PROVINCIAL", DEMANDEZ):  
Quelques députés mentionnent parfois le rôle de porte-parole provincial comme partie intégrante de leur fonction de député.  
(a) Pensez-vous qu'un député devrait exercer ce rôle?  
(b) Considérez-vous ce rôle comme partie intégrante de votre fonction de député?





- \* 12. Y a-t-il des différences entre votre conception actuelle de la fonction de député, et celle que vous aviez avant votre venue à Ottawa?
- \* 13. Y a-t-il des différences entre votre conception actuelle de la fonction de député et celle de vos électeurs? (SONDEZ L'OPINION DE R QUANT AU REALISME DES DEMANDES QUE LUI ADRESSENT SES ELECTEURS.)
- 14. (a) De quelles sources vous parviennent les renseignements les plus exacts et les plus utiles touchant les sentiments politiques de vos électeurs? (ATTENDEZ LA REponse, PUIS DEMANDEZ:)
  - les éditoriaux des journaux locaux
  - les lettres à l'éditeur de ces journaux
  - les chefs et militants du parti dans le comté
  - les chefs d'entreprises
  - les dirigeants municipaux
  - les dirigeants syndicaux
  - les chefs religieux
  - les directeurs des associations ethniques
  - des amis personnels et des connaissances
- (b) (PRESENTEZ LA CARTE) Lesquelles de ces sources d'information vous apparaissent les plus utiles? Pourriez-vous les classifier par ordre d'importance?
  - les éditoriaux des journaux locaux
  - les lettres à l'éditeur de ces journaux
  - les chefs et militants du parti dans le comté
  - les chefs d'entreprises
  - les dirigeants municipaux
  - les dirigeants syndicaux
  - les chefs religieux
  - les directeurs des associations ethniques
  - des amis personnels et des connaissances
- \* (c) Que faites-vous pour garder contact avec l'organisation locale du parti?
- (d) Que faites-vous pour garder contact avec les partisans et notables locaux du parti?
- \* (e) En temps normal, combien de lettres par semaine recevez-vous de vos électeurs?
- \* (f) Quels sont les sujets qui reviennent le plus souvent dans ces lettres?
- \* (g) Vos électeurs utilisent-ils d'autres moyens pour entrer en communication avec vous? (RECHERCHEZ LES DEPUTATIONS, (GROUPEs DE PRESSIONS) - LEUR FREQUENCE - LEUR APPROBATION OU DESAPPROBATION.)
- \* 15. Certains députés considèrent qu'il fait partie de leur travail de renseigner et d'éduquer leurs électeurs sur les faits et gestes du Parlement. Que pensez-vous de cette attitude?
- \* 16. (a) Normalement, comment entrez-vous en communication avec vos électeurs? (SONDEZ EN PROFONDEUR)
- \* (b) De quelles façons vous rendez-vous disponible à vos électeurs?
- \* (c) Combien de jours par mois passez-vous dans votre comté?



17. Nous savons qu'un député peut avoir des opinions qui diffèrent de celles du parti. Que feriez-vous probablement dans le cas où vous voudriez exprimer une opinion contraire aux vues majoritaires du parti? (SONDEZ EN PROFONDEUR. SI R PRETEND POUVOIR INFLUENCER LE PARTI DE FAÇON NON OFFICIELLE, SONDEZ SOIGNEUSEMENT LES VOIES QU'IL POURRAIT PRENDRE. S'IL AVANCE QUE TOUT DEPEND DES CIRCONSTANCES, ESSAYEZ DE SAVOIR QUELLES SONT CES CIRCONSTANCES.)
18. (a) Vous désirez prendre position sur une question débattue en Chambre. Vous savez par ailleurs qu'une majorité de vos électeurs aimerait vous voir adopter la position contraire. Que feriez-vous, probablement, dans ce cas?
- (b) (SI R S'EFFORCERAIT DE CHANGER L'OPINION DE SES ÉLECTEURS, DEMANDEZ:)  
Quels moyens utiliseriez-vous pour modifier leur opinion sur le sujet? (EXPLOREZ PLEINEMENT)
- (c) Si vous ne pouviez pas changer les opinions d'un grand nombre de vos électeurs, que feriez-vous probablement?
19. (a) En toute vraisemblance, que feriez-vous dans le cas où la position du parti sur une question s'opposait à celle de vos électeurs? Iriez-vous dans le sens du parti ou dans le sens de vos électeurs?
- \* (b) En quelles circonstances un député est-il justifié de voter en sens contraire du parti?
- \* (c) En quelles circonstances un député est-il justifié de voter en sens contraire aux opinions de ses électeurs?
- \* (d) En quelles circonstances le vote devrait-il être entièrement libre?
20. Combien de fois avez-vous voté contre le parti depuis l'élection du présent Parlement?
- \* 21. Diriez-vous que la fonction de député exige que l'on s'y engage à plein temps, ou bien, diriez-vous qu'il est possible d'être un bon député tout en ayant d'autres activités?
- \* (b) En plus de votre fonction de député, quelles autres activités avez-vous?
- (c) Combien de temps en moyenne consacrez-vous à ces autres activités durant la session?
22. (a) Quelle est la fréquence de réunion des caucus de votre parti?



- \* (b) Assistez-vous souvent aux caucus du parti, toujours, quelquefois, rarement, habituellement, jamais?
- toujours.....  
habituellement.....  
quelquefois.....  
rarement.....  
jamais.....
- \* (c) Quelles sont d'après vous les deux principales fonctions d'un caucus général de votre parti?
- \* (d) Une décision prise au caucus général oblige-t-elle tous les membres?
- \* (e) (SI NON) Sous quelles conditions n'oblige-t-elle pas?
- (f) Personnellement, parlez-vous français aux caucus du parti?
- (g) (SI OUI DEMANDEZ) Régulièrement? (SI NON REGULIEREMENT, DEMANDEZ:)  
A quelles occasions parlez-vous français?
- \* (h) Personnellement, parlez-vous Anglais aux caucus du parti?
- \* (i) (SI OUI, DEMANDEZ:) Régulièrement? (SI NON REGULIEREMENT, DEMANDEZ:) A quelles occasions parlez-vous Anglais?
- \* 23. (a) Etes-vous membre d'un caucus régional ou provincial? Lequel?  
Oui: regional  
Oui: provincial  
Non: ni l'un ni l'autre.  
(SI R N'EST PAS MEMBRE D'UN PARTI QUI TIEN DES CAUCUS REGIONAUX OU PROVINCIAUX, PASSEZ A LA QUESTION 24.)  
  
(SI OUI A "A", DEMANDEZ LES QUESTIONS SUIVANTES)
- \* (b) Quelle est la fréquence des réunions de ces caucus?
- \* (c) Assistez-vous souvent aux caucus provinciaux (régionaux):?  
Toujours, habituellement, quelquefois, rarement, jamais?  
toujours .....  
habituellement.....  
quelquefois.....  
rarement.....  
jamais.....
- \* (d) Quelles sont les deux principales fonctions de votre caucus provincial (régional)?
- \* (e) Est-ce qu'une décision d'un caucus provincial (régional) oblige tous les membres de ce caucus?
- (f) (SI NON) Sous quelles conditions n'oblige-t-elle pas?





- (g) Personnellement, parlez-vous français au caucus provincial (régional)?
- (h) (SI OUI) Régulièrement? (SI NON REGULIEREMENT) A quelles occasions parlez-vous français?
- (i) Personnellement, parlez-vous Anglais au caucus provincial (régional)?
- (j) (SI OUI) Régulièrement? (SI NON REGULIEREMENT) A quelles occasions parlez-vous Anglais?

24. (a) Revenons encore à votre fonction de député. Quelles sont les difficultés les plus sérieuses dans l'exercice de cette fonction? Qu'est-ce qui entrave votre travail de député?  
(ALLEZ AU DELA D'ENONCES VAGUES TELS QUE: "INSUFFICANCE DE TEMPS": OBTENEZ DES REPONSES SPECIFIQUES SUR CE QUI L'EMPECHE D'ACCOMPLIR SON TRAVAIL COMME IL AIMERAIT LE FAIRE. "EXPLOREZ LES RELATIONS ENTRE FONCTIONNAIRES ET DEPUTES TOUCHANT LES AFFAIRES DE COMTE, EN REGARD DU DEGRE DE COOPERATION DES FONCTIONNAIRES, DU NIVEAU OU S'ETABLIT CETTE COOPERATION ET EN REGARD DE L'APTITUDE DES FONCTIONNAIRES A UTILISER LES DEUX LANGUES.

(b) Quelles réformes aimeriez-vous opérer si vous le pouviez?

\* 25. Considérons maintenant le rôle de la Chambre des communes dans son ensemble et sa place dans notre système de gouvernement.

(a) En premier lieu, quel rôle la Chambre des communes devrait-elle exercer dans notre système gouvernemental? (SONDEZ LE ROLE DES COMMUNES FACE AU CABINET)

\* (b) Dans quelle mesure la Chambre des communes joue-t-elle efficacement le(s) rôles (s) que vous lui attribuez? (CHERCHEZ DES MANQUEMENTS SPECIFIQUES SI R EN A PRESENTS A L'ESPRIT).

\* (c) (S'IL Y A, SELON R, UN ECART ENTRE CE QUE FAIT LA CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES ET CE QU'ELLE DEVRAIT FAIRE, DEMANDEZ:)  
Quelles sont les difficultés les plus sérieuses qui empêchent la Chambre des communes de faire ce que vous croyez qu'elle devrait faire?

\* 26. (a) Quel rôle, selon vous, le Sénat devrait-il jouer dans notre système gouvernemental?

\* (b) Dans quelle mesure le Sénat joue-t-il efficacement le (s) rôle (s) que vous lui attribuez? (CHERCHEZ DES MANQUEMENTS SPECIFIQUES SI R EN A PRESENTS A L'ESPRIT).



27. On dit parfois qu'en dépit de toutes les différences d'opinions qui apparaissent de temps à autre en Chambre, les simples députés en arrivent à une plus grande compréhension mutuelle qu'on ne l'imagine bien souvent. Qu'en pensez-vous?
- \* 28. (a) Qui sont vos amis les plus intimes à la Chambre? Je veux dire les membres que vous voyez le plus souvent en dehors de la Chambre, à l'occasion de repas, ren contres sociales?  
(ESSAYEZ D'OBTENIR SIX NOMS)
- \* (b) D'après votre expérience, pouvez-vous fournir des cas où des échanges officiels avec d'autres députés
- (i) vous auraient actuellement rendu plus sympathique à un point de vue auquel vous étiez tout d'abord opposé?  
(ii) .....vous auraient rendu moins sympathique?
- \* 29. (a) Pensez-vous qu'il y a un problème de communication entre députés français et Anglais? (SI OUI) Quel est ce problème?
- \* (b) (SI PROBLEME IL Y A, DEMANDEZ:) Que fait-on, en autant que quelque chose se fasse, pour régler ce problème?
- \* (c) Avez-vous personnellement travaillé à résoudre ce problème?  
(SI OUI) Qu'avez-vous fait?
- (d) A quels membres de la Chambre avez-vous tendance à vous référer, pour obtenir une meilleure compréhension du point de vue canadien-anglais? (ESSAYEZ D'OBTENIR TROIS NOMS)
- \* (e) Y a-t-il des personnalités (écrivains, éditorialistes, spécialistes en sciences sociales, politiciens) dont vous écoutez attentivement et respectez le point de vue sur la question des relations entre Franco et Anglo-canadiens?  
(ESSAYEZ D'OBTENIR SIX NOMS)
- \* 30. (a) Quels sont d'après vous, les effets du bilinguisme sur la conduite des activités parlementaires? (RECHERCHEZ LES PROBLEMES QUI EN RESULTENT AU PLAN PERSONNEL, AU NIVEAU DES COMITES, DES CAUCUS, ET A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE.
- \* (b) Etes-vous pleinement satisfait du présent système de traduction?  
(EXPLOREZ LES SERVICES DE TRADUCTION ORALE ET ECRITE DE LA CHAMBRE. RECHERCHEZ LES REFERENCES A SON APPLICATION REELLE (AUX COMMUNES) ET SON ABSENCE (AU SEIN DES COMITES).
- (c) Quel est le rôle de l'Orateur dans la conduite du système bilingue?
- \* 31. (a) Quel serait votre description du rôle des chefs de parti à la Chambre des communes? (RECHERCHEZ UNE REPONSE COMPLETE: NOUS SOMMES INTERESSES A CONNAITRE LA CONCEPTION DE R, NON SEULEMENT DES ROLES DE SON CHEF, MAIS AUSSI DES ROLES DES AUTRES CHEFS DE PARTI.)



- \* 31. (b) Quelles sont, à votre avis, les raisons principales de l'influence des chefs de votre parti sur votre parti?
- (c) i) Avez-vous beaucoup de rapports personnels avec la direction de votre parti?  
ii) Qui tendez-vous à voir le plus souvent?  
iii) Bien souvent?  
iv) A quelles occasions?  
v) Quelle influence le "whip" du parti exerce-t-il sur vous?  
vi) Comment influence-t-il votre comportement politique?  
vii) Le "whip" de votre parti est-il bilingue de par sa fonction?
- (d) Y a-t-il au gouvernement certains ministres à qui vous allez normalement demander renseignement, conseil, et assistance?  
(ESSAYEZ D'AVOIR DES NOMS)
- i) Y allez-vous souvent?  
ii) A quelles occasions?
32. (a) Revenant de nouveau à ce qui vous touche, quels seraient vos principaux intérêts politiques?
- (b) Quels sont vos moyens les plus utiles et les plus importants de faire avancer ces intérêts? (EXPLORER LES REFERENCES A CE QU'IL FAIT ET CE QU'IL AIMERAIT POUVOIR FAIRE.)
- (c) (SI NON DEJA MENTIONNE, DEMANDEZ:) Avez-vous déjà trouvé qu'il valait la peine de former un groupe non officiel a l'intérieur du parti en vue de pour-suivre des intérêts communs?  
(ESSAYEZ DE DECOUVRIR SI LA DIRECTION DU PARTI DESAPPROUVE LA FORMATION DE TELS GROUPES.)
- \* 33. (a) Quelles sont d'après vous, les qualités principales d'un bon député?
- \* (b) Croyez-vous votre opinion sur ce sujet partagée par les députés des autres partis?  
(SI NON) En quoi seraient-ils d'un autre avis?
- \* (c) Croyez-vous votre opinion partagée par les députés des autres provinces? (SI NON) En quoi seraient-ils d'un autre avis?
- \* 34. (a) Y a-t-il souvent des occasions où un député canadien-français peut éprouver des sentiments de malaise et de frustration en cherchant à intégrer son action dans les politiques fédérales?
- \* (b) Pouvez-vous donner des exemples?
- \* 35. (a) Estimez-vous que le député canadien-français, en tant que Canadien français, devrait jouer un rôle spécifique a la Chambre et à l'intérieur de son parti?
- \* (b) Quel rôle devrait-il jouer?





- \* (c) Arrive-t-il en pratique à jouer ce rôle?
- \* 36. (a) Pensez-vous que le député canadien-anglais en tant que Canadien anglais, devrait jouer un rôle spécifique à la Chambre et au sein de son parti?
- \* (b) Quel rôle devrait-il jouer?
- \* (c) Arrive-t-il en pratique à jouer ce rôle?
- \* 37. (a) Votre attitude générale envers les Anglo-canadiens a-t-elle changé depuis votre élection au Parlement?
- \* (b) (SI OUI) En quoi a-t-elle changé?
- \* (c) Quelles sont les causes de ce changement?
- \* 38. Pensez-vous que l'on perd de l'argent en politique, même si l'on gagne l'élection et touche l'indemnité parlementaire?
- \* 39. (a) Pensez-vous vous représenter à l'élection du prochain Parlement?  
Oui..... Non..... DK.....
- \* (b) (SI OUI OU NON) Pour quelles raisons?
- \* 40. Y a-t-il certaines fonctions publiques que vous aimeriez exercer dans le futur?  
(SI OUI) Laquelle? (Lesquelles?)
- \* 41. (a) Si pour une raison quelconque, vous deviez aujourd'hui résigner votre fonction de député, qu'est-ce que vous regretteriez le plus?
- \* (b) Que regretteriez-vous le moins?
- \* 42. (a) Habitez-vous Ottawa?
- \* (b) Votre famille est-elle ici?
- \* (c) La ville d'Ottawa est-elle une ville où un député canadien-français peut se sentir chez lui?
- \* (d) La ville d'Ottawa est-elle une ville où un député canadien-anglais peut se sentir chez lui?
- \* (e) La ville d'Ottawa est-elle une capitale qui convienne au Canada?



Nous avons collectionné des affirmations faites par des députés et autres, sur leur vie et leur travail. Vous allez peut-être les trouver trop simplifiées, cependant nous aimerions obtenir votre réaction générale à chacun de ces énoncés. Il n'y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses, chaque énoncé étant matière d'opinion. Quand je vous aurai remis cette liste, pourriez-vous lire chaque énoncé et ensuite pointer la réponse qui exprime le mieux votre accord ou désaccord.

- |   |                                |                          |              |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1. La plupart du temps la politique officielle du parti est déterminée avant que le simple député ait eu la chance d'exercer d'une influence. | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 2. La plupart du temps, un député peut dire ce que ses électeurs pensent d'une question, avant même les avoir consultés.                      | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 3. Il serait préférable que les ministres français parlent toujours français; ils s'exprimeraient de manière plus satisfaisante.              | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 4. L'assistance sociale qu'un député procure à ses électeurs contribué grandement à sa réélection.  | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 5. Les conférences fédérales-provinciales tendent à diminuer l'importance du Parlement.   | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 6. La politique c'est pourri.   | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |
| 7. L'organisation locale du parti a eu bien peu d'affaire à mon élection.   | D'accord                       | Tendance à être d'accord | Incertain    |
|   | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord |                          | Pas d'accord |



8. Un sénat conçu comme une "chambre des nationalités", représentant Anglais et Français en porportion égale, serait une réforme utile a notre système parlementaire.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
9. Les gens tendent à juger un parti à la valeur de son chef	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
10. L'addition du caucus provincial au système des partis, à la Chambre des Communes, est cause de scission et est malvenue.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
11. La plupart des nouveaux membres du Parlement apprennent plus "en se la fermant" qu'en essayant de prouver leur habileté.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
12. Le vote d'un député est toujours un indice veridique de ses sentiments.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
13. Les gens exagèrent continuellement l'importance du caucus du parti. C'est un lien pour échapper de la vapeur, mais pas pour influencer la politique du parti.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
14. Les députés du Québec ont tendance à s'occuper davantage des intérêts de leurs électeurs que des politiques nationales.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord
15. En rapport avec les demandes qui leur sont faites, les députés sont chroniquement sous-rémunérés.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
	Tendance à n'être pas d'accord		Pas d'accord





- |     |  |          |                                |              |
|-----|--|----------|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 16. | Il est absolument essentiel qu'un député fasse l'expérience des banquettes arrières de la Chambre, avant de se voir confier un poste au Cabinet.             | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 17. | La Chambre des Communes serait une institution beaucoup plus efficace si elle était réduite, disons à 150 membres, chacun ayant ses adjoints rémunérés.      | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 18. | La plupart des électeurs s'intéressent plus aux services qu'un député peut leur rendre qu'à ses vues sur les projets de loi déposés en Chambre.              | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 19. | La discipline de parti est aujourd'hui trop sévère.  | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 20. | L'idée de voir alterner Canadiens français et Canadiens anglais à la direction des partis politiques est une bonne idée et devrait être généralement suivie. | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 21. | Souvent les députés sont si accaparés par leurs affaires à Ottawa qu'ils perdent contact avec leurs électeurs.   | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 22. | Les simples députés reçoivent trop peu d'invitations à s'exprimer en public.   | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |
| 23. | La plupart des électeurs vous respecteront d'autant plus si vous maintenez vos vues face à leur opposition.  | D'accord | Tendance à être d'accord       | Incertain    |
|     |  |          | Tendance à n'être pas d'accord | Pas d'accord |



24.	Les députés anglais cher- chent avant tout à ne pas ébranler la machine du parti.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
25.	La Chambre des Communes devrait s'adjoindre un corps professionnel plus nombreux, afin d'avoir ses propres sources d'information technique.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
26.	Notre système parlementaire prend pour acquit que le simple député jouera un rôle mineur dans l'élaboration des projets de lois.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
27.	Les députés canadiens-anglais sont plus libres face aux or- ganisations du parti que les députés canadiens-français.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
28.	Les facilités de traduction devraient s'étendre à toutes les salles de conférences en comité, peu importe le coût.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
29.	Vous pouvez avoir de grandes idées à votre arrivée à Ottawa, mais vous apprenez bien vite que les idées ne vous mèneront nulle part.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord
30.	Les électeurs demandent toujours aux députés de faire quelque chose qui n'a rien à voir à leurs occupations à Ottawa: plus souvent que pas, il s'agit d'une question provinciale, ou même muni- cipale.	D'accord	Tendance à être d'accord	Incertain
			Tendance à n'être pas d'accord	Pas d'accord



Esquisse Biographique

1. Où êtes-vous né?
2. Quel âge avez-vous?
3. Combien d'années avez-vous vécu dans le comté que vous représentez?  
Si ne vivant pas dans le comté, où vivez-vous?
4. Quel fut le plus haut niveau de scolarité auquel vous êtes parvenu?
5. Avez-vous des degrés professionnels? Lesquels?
6. A. Quelle était l'origine ethnique de votre famille du côté de  
votre père?  
B. du côté de votre mère?
7. Quelle était l'occupation habituelle de votre père durant votre période  
de dépendance familiale?
8. Quelle est votre occupation principale, (oubliant pour le moment votre  
fonction de député)?
9. Était-ce votre occupation quand vous êtes entré en politique?  
(Oui - Non) Si non, quelle était alors votre occupation?
10. A. Quelles positions avez-vous occupées au sein d'un gouvernement ou  
parti (local, provincial ou fédéral) avant d'être élu député?  
(S.V.P. donner la liste complète).  
B. Occupez-vous de telles positions maintenant? (Quelles sont-elles?)
11. Combien d'années en tout avez-vous été membre de la Chambre?
12. Quels journaux et revues lisez-vous régulièrement?
13. Y a-t-il des livres qui vous auraient profondément impressionné et qui  
auraient contribué à façonner votre carrière politique?





## APPENDIX C

Statement by Davidson Dunton and André Laurendeau  
Co-Chairmen of the  
Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

April 13, 1965.

It appears to be generally agreed that the Commission should seek all relevant information on the bilingual and bicultural aspects of the work of Parliament.

Some of the questions in the survey of Members of Parliament have, however, been said to be not relevant. We believe that such criticism arises from a ~~mis~~understanding of the nature of the survey. ✓

Taken separately some of the questions may indeed appear <sup>✓</sup>relevant. But we believe that taken together the responses can be highly relevant in discovering patterns of differences or similarities in attitudes of members of different language groups toward various aspects of the working of the parliamentary system. Some questions, too, are needed to differentiate between possible cultural and regional divergences. A questionnaire is a research tool; it should be assessed in its entirety and not by isolating any of the component parts.

The survey is based on recent but thoroughly tested techniques of social science research. We believe that to carry out its mandate properly the Commission cannot be content with just superficial inquiries, but must endeavour to investigate below the surface using well developed, carefully worked out and appropriate methods.

It should be emphasized that responses of individual members are kept strictly confidential; and also that no member is under any obligation either to be interviewed at all or to answer any particular question. It is not the set of responses of any one individual that counts but rather the tabulation of all responses in an integrated research design.

The study is a serious scientific attempt to add to the body of knowledge about the state of bilingualism and biculturalism in the most *important* single institution in the country and at the same time to deepen the understanding of the whole parliamentary process as it relates to the development of "the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution of other ethnic groups".

We believe, therefore, that the survey should continue on the same voluntary confidential basis as before. If refusals become too high the interviews, of course, will be stopped. Sixty-seven members have already been interviewed and only eight others have refused to date. As long as



high response rate continues, the interviews will go on unchanged.

The Commission has been charged with carrying out an inquiry; and that in fact is precisely what it is trying to do. Surely in all good sense it should not be hampered or blocked as it endeavours to fulfill the purpose for which it was established; nor be called on continually to justify the methods which after careful consideration it deems suitable. We believe this would be a dangerous precedent from which the work of this and other royal commissions could suffer.



## APPENDIX D

### AVERAGE LENGTH OF INTERVIEWS

#### ENGLISH SPEAKING INTERVIEWS:

average length of interviews before crisis: 131 minutes  
average length of interviews after crisis: 115 minutes  
average length overall: 123 minutes

#### FRENCH SPEAKING INTERVIEWS:

average length of interviews before crisis: 180 minutes  
average length of interviews after crisis: 153 minutes  
average length overall: 167 minutes

#### COMBINED AVERAGES:

before crisis: 145 minutes  
after crisis: 126 minutes  
overall: 136 minutes





## APPENDIX E

### INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF RESPONDENTS

<u>COOPERATION</u>	<u>English R's</u>		<u>French R's</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Before crisis</u>	<u>After crisis</u>	<u>Before crisis</u>	<u>After crisis</u>	
very co-operative	24	28	11	9	72
co-operative	14	9	6	4	33
not very co-operative	2	4	1	3	10
openly hostile	1*	-	1***	-	2
no answer	1**	3	-	1	5
N	42	44	19	17	122

<u>FRANKNESS</u>					
very frank	19	18	11	7	55
frank	16	17	7	4	44
not very frank	6	7	-	5	18
no answer	1	32	1	1	5
N	42	44	17	17	122

\* only on some questions

\*\* incomplete interview

\*\*\* "aggressive"



## APPENDIX F

### NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL REACTION TO M.P. SURVEY

#### FAVOURABLE

Ottawa Citizen  
Montreal Gazette  
Globe & Mail  
Winnipeg Free Press  
Le Devoir  
Red Deer Advocate  
Toronto Telegram  
La Presse  
Montreal Matin  
Toronto Star

#### UNFAVOURABLE

Calgary Albertan  
Peterborough Examiner  
Nanaimo Free Press  
Halifax Mail-Star  
Times & Conservator (Brampton)  
Charlottetown Patriot  
Western Business & Industry  
Leduc Representative  
Calgary Herald  
Vancouver Times  
Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph  
Hamilton Spectator  
Telegraph-Journal(St. John)  
St. Thomas Time-Journal  
Kingston Whig-Standard  
Guelph Guardian  
Saskatoon Star-Phoenix  
Vancouver Sun  
Brockville Recorder & Times  
Le Droit  
Picton Gazette

#### NEUTRAL

Cape Breton Post  
Ottawa Journal  
Edmonton Journal





## APPENDIX G

Copy of the letter sent to  
English-speaking Front Benchers.

Dear Sir:

The study of Members of Parliament being conducted for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism has been making good progress, and the senior interviewers associated with the project now hope to begin interviewing Members from the front benches. I am therefore writing you to arrange a time for an interview convenient to you. I will telephone your secretary on the morning of \_\_\_\_\_, to try to fix a suitable time and date.

Let me assure you now that all interviews are treated with the utmost confidence. We are interested in your responses to a wide range of questions which we hope will be useful in discovering patterns of differences or similarities in attitudes of members of different language groups towards various aspects of the working of the parliamentary system, but nothing you say will be attributed to you. Throughout the interview the focus of attention will be on your role as an M.P. rather than as a Cabinet Minister. You will, of course, be free to reject any questions which you find inappropriate.

Yours sincerely,

